DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 636 UD 019 859

AUTHOR	Bickel, Frank; Qualls, Robert
TITLE	Project Student Concerns: A Study of Minority Student Suspensions. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Jefferson County Education Consortium, Louisville, Ky.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 79
GRANT	G007800780
NOTE	194p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; *Black Students; Caucasian Students; *Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Females; Males; Public Schools; School Environment; Student Attitudes; *Suspension; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Kentucky (Jefferson County)

ABSTRACT

This report is a summary of research completed during the 1978-79 school year concerning the causes of disproportionate minority student suspensions in the Jefferson County public schools. A review of related literature is presented to illustrate that factors other than student behavior may contribute to school disruptions and high rates of suspension. Emphasis in this review is on the behavior of administrators and teachers in the student discipline process. The methodology used in the research study is described and findings from surveys distributed to administrators, teachers and students are analyzed with a focus on the identification of factors that differentiate low and high suspension schools. Particular attention is given to the different responses provided by male and female students and by black and white students. Conclusions regarding teacher behavior, communication patterns, administrative techniques, school climate, student perceptions and their respective influences on suspension policies in both low and high suspension schools are outlined. Appended are samples of the questionnaires used in the study and suspension data. (EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178636

Project Student Concerns:
A Study of Minority Student Suspensions

Interim Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Bickel
Jefferson County
Educ. Consortium
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Frank Bickel and Robert Qualls

Jefferson County Education Consortium
502-581-4561
675 River City Mall
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Sponsored by:
University of Louisville
University of Kentucky
Jefferson County Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The materials incorporated herein were prepared pursuant to grant no. G007800780, Office of Education. The materials contained and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education and no endorsement should be inferred.

September 1979

UD 019859

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I: Review of Literature 5

SECTION II: Methodology 31

SECTION III: Findings 49

SECTION IV: Conclusions and Summary 77

REFERENCES 99

APPENDIX A: Factor Analysis Matrices 105

APPENDIX B: ANOVA Tables 117

APPENDIX C: Teacher Survey Instrument 129

APPENDIX D: Administrator Survey Instrument . . . . .

APPENDIX E: Student Survey Instrument 161

APPENDIX F: Suspension Data 175

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the significant contributions of staff members and others in the conduct of this study and preparation of the interim report.

Project Staff

Frank Bickel	Project Director
Robert Qualls	Research Analyst
Sharon Robinson	Editor
James Harvey	Statistician
Tena Lutz	Secretary
Maude O'Neill	Research Assistant
Steven Riggert	Research Assistant

Introduction

The Jefferson County Education Consortium was awarded a two year Student Concerns Project grant for the period 1976-78. Upon the successful completion of tasks under that grant, a proposal was submitted to the Office of Education for a second, two year grant. The grant was awarded and work on the new project began in July 1978, to be completed by June 1980.

A continuity of purpose has been maintained over the three years of study of student discipline and suspension; i.e., to determine the probable causes of disproportionate minority student suspensions. The project director and research analyst have been in those respective positions during the three-year period, a situation which should provide stability for the project.

Accounts of the events that accompanied the desegregation of the Jefferson County Public Schools may be found in a variety of documents, ranging from newspaper articles to research reports. Project staff feel that it is unnecessary to recount those events to provide a frame of reference for this study.

The excessive suspension rates of many schools in this school system, and accompanying disproportionate rates of suspension for minority students, have diminished only slightly during the three years of the project's experience. A variety of staff development activities and special projects seem to have had minimal impact on the suspension rates. School officials and administrators in the individual schools are aware of and concerned about the suspension problem and appear to be making efforts to address the problem.

Local school officials and administrators, with few exceptions, have been very cooperative with project staff, particularly during the past project year (1978-79); however, the issue of disproportionate suspensions of minority students is a very sensitive one, and has engendered some feelings of defensiveness and wariness among some school staff.

This interim report is a summary of research completed during the school year 1978-79. The second year of the project (1979-80) will focus on designing staff development strategies and materials to address the problems surfaced as a result of the study.

SECTION I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review addresses administrative and teaching behavior in the student discipline process. It provides a theoretical base upon which questions have been formulated about administrator and teacher input to the student discipline process. Further, the review is indicative of the magnitude of national interest and concern relative to the possible negative impact of administrator and teacher behaviors on student outcomes.

Attention is often directed toward the inability of students to cope with problems associated with school desegregation. Implied is the notion that school disorders exist primarily because students in recent years have developed a disdain for authority and lack of respect for adult school leaders.

However, a contrasting point of view suggests that students are not totally responsible for the disorder and chaos that exists in some public schools. The following review is presented to illustrate that factors other than student behavior may exist within schools which contribute to school disruptions and high rates of suspensions.

The Administrator and Student Discipline

Principal as a Leader

The principal's functions as leader, as well as mediator, are suggested in a statement by Ackerly and Gluckman (1976) which speaks of the centrality of the principal's position in the school. The manager, change agent, and disciplinarian roles might also be implicit in their description:

> "Because the principal of a secondary school is a highly visible and influential figure in the administrative structure of the school, he characteristically finds himself at the point where the often conflicting wishes and ambitions of students, teachers, and parents collide

> with overall school administration policy. It is the principal above all others who must undertake to make these divergent interests compatible so that the school can be what it is intended to be, a place where learning can occur." (p. 1-2).

As a leader, the principal is "one who facilitates the activities of others through communication, modeling, encouraging, supporting, attaining resources, and the like" (Tye, Galub, and Wall, 1976). According to the 1976 report of the Philadelphia School District, the principal can take several actions relative to establishing a tone of discipline, and a procedure for handling disruptive behavior:

1. Before the Fact

   a. Keep teachers aware of special conditions within the school.

   b. Conduct or organize staff development sessions on successful classroom practices.

   c. Develop with staff, students, and parents procedures for handling crisis situations.

   d. Disseminate this information to all affected groups.

   e. Provide orientation for special problems faced by the students in a particular school.

   f. Involve the staff, students, and parents in the development and periodic review of a school code of conduct.

   g. Jointly develop with parents, students, and staff a plan to deal with cumulative disruptive pupil behavior.

   h. Disseminate this information to parents, students, and staff.

   i. Keep teachers informed of special events, and community activities.

   j. Provide teachers with various opportunities to learn about the community, and provide opportunities with which they can identify.

   k. Encourage teachers to notify administrators of special situations, rumors, impending difficulties, etc.

   l. Discuss with teachers the reasons behind administrative decisions relative to discipline.

m. Keep teachers well-informed and up-to-date relative to all administrative directives, court decisions, etc., and appraise staff members of the actions taken, and reasons for, administrative decisions.

n. Keep all lines of communication open.

2. During a Disruptive Incident

   a. Respond immediately to serious situations and provide medical assistance and examination.

   b. Provide for and understand the possible emotional involvement of the teachers.

   c. Respect the dignity of the teacher as a professional.

   d. Allow a teacher time to regain composure.

   e. Offer immediate relief to the teacher if necessary.

   f. Advise the teacher of each citizen's responsibility to file criminal charges in serious incidents such as assault, theft, etc., and be prepared to support the teacher and assist in the process.

3. After the Fact

   a. Follow through on decisions made relative to the incident.

   b. Evaluate the reaction to the incident with the teacher; indicate how it might better have been handled if necessary.

   c. Attempt to discover the causes of the incident.

   d. If possible, include in any plans of remediation an attempt to eliminate the causes of the incident.

   e. Inform the teacher of remedial measures taken.

   f. Maintain thorough records of the incident.

   g. Utilize available resources in remedying the incident.

   h. Keep lines of communication open. (p. 34-35)

Principal as Mediator

Saxe (p. 28, 1968) discusses the principal's role as mediator when a dispute arises between two or more pupils, or when there is disagreement among the parents, the teachers, the pupil, and the school regarding the problem. Saxe insists that "the first concern is the child" (p. 32), which is in turn best for all concerned. Problems arise when teachers do not feel supported, the parent is not respected, or the child is wronged.

> "If the teacher feels let down he may stop trying and permit more discipline problems to develop. If we enforce the right of a teacher to be right even when he isn't, the child will feel let down, which also may lead to further discipline problems." (p. 32 Saxe, 1968).

According to Saxe the child from the inner city environment may have more problems in the school which has a policy of supporting the teacher whether right or wrong because ...

> "his life is filled with such contradictions; he can find no one to trust, and when the school's discipline system disillusions him, he is not surprised, but also he is not convinced--he must either reject the decision of the school or lose his own sense of integrity" (p. 32).

Not only must the principal mediate among students, parents, and teachers, but at times the principal may have the responsibility of enforcing federal or state guidelines against the will of the community, as in the case of desegregation of schools (Saxe, 1968, p. 102), and the responsibility of enforcing laws governing student rights (Zanella, 1976).

Principal as a Manager

As a manager, the principal's role seems to be very similar to the leadership functions. Doll (1972, p. 3) contends that management, strictly speaking, is the actual operation of the school, but that "in matters of actual performance, ... the distinctiveness of the definitions of executive management and leadership ... may be of greater use intellectually than they are operationally." (p. 13) In regard to discipline, the principal's role as manager is alluded to by several authors, who also seem to use the terms "leader" and "manager" interchangeably (Valenti, 1977; Boyd and Bowers, 1974; George, 1972). However, in the literature surveyed on management functions of the principal in regard to discipline, a common factor seems to be principal manipulation of the school environment and the community in order to prevent or deal with discipline problems. As a disciplinarian, the principal will generally intervene when a teacher's attempts to solve problems in the classroom have failed.

The principal's role as change agent in the school is an important consideration in regard to school discipline (Heichberger, 1973). School authority is being challenged and student civil rights are becoming a major concern in the public schools (Griffiths, 1968). Desegregation is a critical issue (Turnage, 1972) and traditional means of dealing with behavior problms are being closely monitored by the public and the courts (Zanella, 1976). Griffiths (1968) describes the principal as having "a precarious role to play in helping his institution adapt to the dynamics of society, since as an institution the secondary school properly reflects social change." (p. 31).

Principals' Effect on School Climate

The central and influential role of the principal is alluded to by Saxe (1968, p. 91), who says that "to residents of a community and parents of pupils, the principal _is_ the school." He cites case examples of how principals have dealt with community curiosity and scrutiny of their schools differently and with differing results. For example, he describes a recent interaction between school principals of a large north-midwestern city who were confronted by civil rights groups insistent upon visiting schools to publicize their concern for the quality of education of black students. The principals generally responded by blocking the groups' entrance as "unauthorized persons". However, Saxe reports that one principal invited the group in to tour the school unattended after having prepared the faculty in advance for the visit. The school's openness and lack of suspicion seemed to be very well received by the group, which had expected resistance, and they were favorably impressed by both the school's atmosphere and performance. Saxe contends that this example illustrates the control which the principal has over "establishing an open climate of mutual trust and respect ... (in which) parents and pupils do not oppose the school." (p. 95).

Doll (1972, p. 285) reports on a study by Halpin and Croft which investigated various behaviors of teachers and principals to determine those behaviors which most influenced school climate. The four most influential principal behaviors were:

1) Aloofness, or remoteness from the staff seen in a tendency to follow rules and regulations regardless of the individual needs of staff members.
2) Production emphasis, indicated by the close supervision and directive behavior the principal practices.
3) Thrust, the drive which the principal demonstrates in "moving" the school, and which becomes a model to the teachers.
4) Consideration, the inclination to treat teachers according to good human relations principles.

Principal behaviors were studied by Pederson (1970) in an attempt to "identify effective and ineffective action of the high school principal as perceived by high school seniors." Forty-eight percent of the students "identified effective behavior ... as those acts in which the principal lavishes friendship, humor, courtesy, consideration, sincerity, praise, encouragement, interest, and support of pupils, faculty and all phases of the school program," (p. 260) and those acts were generally small gestures of a friendly nature.

Lack of visibility around the school was most frequently mentioned by these students as an ineffective principal behavior. The importance of the principal's visible presence is also mentioned by Kostman (1972) and Valenti (1977). Valenti suggests that the principal "spend a significant portion of his time each day in the halls, cafeteria, lounge, and classrooms ... and spend a minimum of 50 percent of his time with the school family" (p. 91). Kostman reported that principal visibility served two purposes. First, the principal's presence in the halls and cafeteria offers an opportunity to observe firsthand the school's atmosphere and problems; and secondly, the students and staff gained the impression that the principal "was there, available and interested rather than remote and omniscient" (p. 13).

The influence of the principal's verbal behavior on the school environment was studied by Valentine, Tate, Seagren, and Lammel (1975), and it was found that "significant relationships (exist) between what the administrator said and the climate of ... (his) school." (p. 72). A correlation was found between the directness of the principal's verbal interactions and positive attitudes among the members of the school community. Significant verbal behaviors included the use of humor, the expression of personal attitudes and opinions, and "giving clear directions when appropriate." (p. 73). The findings of the report indicate that a "domino effect" exists within the school, and that the quality of the principal's interactions with the faculty is the critical point in this chain, as the teacher has the most direct contact with both students and parents.

Principals' Indirect Influence

A study by Tjosvold and Kastelic (1976) supports the contention that the principal's attitudes influence the students through the teachers. They studied the effects of student motivation and principals' attitudes toward student control on teacher directiveness and found that the values of the principals toward student control (control vs. collaboration), in interaction with student motivation, definitely influenced the manner in which teachers interacted with their unmotivated students. The researchers concluded "that the values of the supervisor are crucial in determining teacher actions when students are unmotivated." (p. 772).

Another study of the effect of principals' attitudes or traits on teachers by Gubser (1969) focused on "authoritarianism among teachers and school principals and its possible relationship to faculty morale" (p. 36). No relationship was found between authoritarian levels of principals and their teaching faculties. However, significant relationships were found between authoritarianism and certain morale factors. In general, older teachers scored higher in authoritarianism and in such morale factors as "teacher status". (p. 38). The authors concluded that:

> "no contention that autocratic administrators directly create an atmosphere of authoritarianism in their schools would appear supportable in light of the findings of this study. Principals may, however, have an indirect effect on the level of authoritarianism of their faculties if, for example, they discourage younger, more anti-authoritarian teachers from remaining on their staffs." (p. 38).

They further concluded that:

> "it would ... appear plausible that the results of this study are pointing to a selection process in which more liberal teachers quit the teaching profession while more authoritarian teachers, satisfied with their salaries and positions, go on to make teaching a career." (p. 38).

Therefore, although the results of Gubser's study do not suggest a direct relationship between principals' personality traits and teacher traits, an indirect relationship cannot be ruled out. This indirect relationship, which the author hypothesizes is a selection process, is supported by a study by Ley (1966), who found that employees "are more likely to terminate their employment if assigned to a foreman exceeding them in authoritarianism than a foreman whom they exceed in authoritarianism" (p. 38).

Not only are the principal's values, attitudes and personality reflected in the school climate, but certain objective characteristics may also be influential in determining school atmosphere. In a recent study of 90 percent of Kansas secondary school principals and the status of student civil rights in their schools, Kallem (1975) found that:

> "the factors of the age of the principal, his number of years of experience in his present position, and the highest degree earned by him all appeared to have a definite relationship to the status of student civil rights" (p. 58).

However, a study by Bullock (1969) appears to contradict Kallem's findings. Bullock investigated the relationship between level of academic training and years of administrative experience of high school principals, and their role perceptions, based on the assumption that a principal's behavior is influenced by his role perceptions. His study found no significant relationship between the principals' levels of training and experience and their own perceptions of their roles.

From the conflicting findings of these two studies, it appears impossible to determine whether principals' characteristics such as training and experience have an effect upon school climate. Furthermore, Wiggins (1972; 1971) cites research evidence indicating the possibility that school climate influences the principal's behavior as the length of incumbency increases.

Two factors affecting a principal's leadership role and effect on school climate may be school size and location. Rideout (1974) found a

> "negative relationship between increased school size and positive perceptions of organizational climate, alienation, teacher-student relationships, student deviant behavior, and extra-class opportunities and participation." (p. 164).

and furthermore,

> "urbanality also was (found to be) related to less favorable perceptions of climate, alienation, student deviant behavior and extra-class participation" (p. 165).

Rideout concludes that large schools demonstrate "bureaucratic characteristics" and "that the organizational structure of large schools has a built-in impersonality that impinges on the students' perceptions of their well-being in school" (p. 170). In a similar vein, Brumbaugh (1969) warns that "as schools and school districts continue to become larger, the strain toward bureaucracy and organizational formalism grows more intense." (p. 168).

From the evidence presented above it appears that the principal's behavior has a direct effect upon school climate and, therefore, on student behavior. However, the evidence of the effect of principal attitudes and certain objective characteristics on school climate appears less obvious, and there is some evidence that other factors such as school size and possibly location may mitigate the principal's effect upon the school. Valenti (1977) underscores the importance of the principal's presence in the school:

> "The principal and assistants who constantly search for formal and informal contacts with students and staff are well on their way to humanizing the environment, upgrading morale, and lessening the hazards of discipline conflict. Individualized and personalized

> education begins with knowing and interacting with students in multiple environments--in the classroom, on the school campus, at extracurricular activities, and in the community." (p. 92).

Management Techniques

According to Vacca (1971) "someone must structure, plan, control, and manage the situations and learning experiences of students to prevent randomness of action and ultimate chaos." (p. 405). The principal's managerial function in relation to discipline will include those strategies used to prevent and cope with discipline problems.

Behavioral science has provided one type of management system called "contingency management". George, (1972) in reporting on this method, asserts that the principal's task is to provide "appropriate positive motivation" for improved student behavior so that the principal is "the source of reward rather than punishment". (p. 33). He lists four essential steps in this strategy:

1. Select the behavior to be changed.
2. Establish a baseline of how many times within a certain period the behavior occurs.
3. Choose a suitable reward. "If the change desired involves something the principal wants to see happen more often ..., the principal must try his best to structure a situation in which the behavior occurs ... Then he immediately follows the behavior with the chosen positive reinforcement." However, if the behavior is one to be eliminated, the principal must reward the absence of that behavior.
4. Check again to see how often the behavior is occurring and compare with the original baseline. If no improvement is indicated, check the process again.

According to George, the idea is eventually to have students and teachers associate their schools with positive, rewarding experiences rather than with negative, punitive experiences.

Similarly, Boyd and Bowers (1974) use the term "behavioral analysis" to describe "a diagnostic methodology which has been developed within the field of behavior modification ... (which) consists of identifying and assessing the behaviors that comprise a problem, and the antecedent and consequent contingencies that influence the behaviors." (p. 420). It follows that once the problem has been diagnosed within this framework, learning theory principles can be applied to change unwanted behaviors.

The authors suggest five guidelines for use by the principal in coping with discipline problems:

1. Have referral sources present a behavioral description of the problem incident, including the incident, factors which led up to the incident, and the resulting consequences. An assessment should accompany this report, indicating the frequency and intensity of the behavior in question. In this way, the FACTS are presented.

2. A behavioral analysis of school efforts to deal with the problem is important in showing all concerned that the school has indeed exhausted its own resources in trying to help the problem student. This method helps the principal separate events from emotional reports such as "I've tried all I know", and "He cannot be helped". Consistent use of this specific method will help reveal where efforts have been inadequate or ineffective.

3. In conversing with offenders and with staff regarding offenders, the principal can avoid labeling or condemning the person by expressing his dissatisfaction with the specific behaviors involved. In this manner an attitude of respect for students can be effectively modeled.

4. The focus is on responsible behavior on the part of both students and the school. The school can teach responsible behavior.

5. The principal can hire a staff of helping professionals trained in behavioral science, who are held accountable for helping students change their behavior. The principal can support them in performing their professional duties rather than assigning them clerical tasks.

Behavioral science is just one source for management ideas and techniques. Kostman (1972) and Valenti (1977) reported in separate articles some management principles which they have found to be useful in maintaining a humanistic school atmosphere. Valenti proposes four principles for use by school principals which are amazingly similar to the approach used by Kostman in his school:

1. High visibility is at the heart of effective discipline.

21

2. Humanism in education begins with the principal as the model of human interaction.

3. The principal and his administrative team must develop a highly visible platform on discipline to publicize to media, parents, and community.

4. The principal and his administrative team must develop a management style that motivates and directs the school family toward accomplishing the school and district organizational goals.

A report by the Philadelphia School District (1976) outlines specifically some resources which the principal has at his disposal in preventing and coping with problems.

1. The school curriculum
    a. design courses which teach citizens' rights and responsibilities.
    b. use guidance periods to reinforce proper rules of conduct.
    c. strive for relevant curriculum.
2. Scheduling
3. Deployment of school personnel - Use personnel effectively in locations where misbehavior could occur, at potentially disruptive activities, during "free" times during the day, etc.
4. Careful attention to student placement policies and procedures can help prevent problems.
5. Be alert to early signs of problems.
6. Have procedures developed in case of group disruption and serious incidents.
7. Develop alternatives to suspension.
8. Use suspension wisely.
9. Consider working with other schools in the area to develop a combined program of pooled resources.
10. In the event of increasing disciplinary problems, funds from extracurricular activities might be used in developing corrective programs.
11. Learn about and use community based resources.

Marcus (1977) suggests one approach to reducing behavior problems which is tailored to each individual school. He advises keeping an account of disruptive incidents to be examined in relation to the school calendar. It may be found that certain days of the week, times of the year, or events during or after school coincide with higher rates of student unrest. Marcus proposes that:

> "Once the principal has identified the effects of the school calendar on the behavior of the student body, he can begin to execute changes. He might rearrange the activity schedule in an effort to decrease student restlessness. Student motivation might be enhanced with the introduction of new high-interest activities during particularly bleak periods in the calendar." (p. 90)

Still another management style is presented in an article by Wint (1975). He reports on the methods of a principal who turned a strife-torn New York high school into "one of the most peaceful and highly organized schools in the nation" (p. 175). He asserts that the principal's primary duty is to maintain orderly classrooms so as to permit learning to take place, and describes this particular principal as one who "lets his students know who is the boss" (p. 175). The principles and strategies used by the principal in "handling discipline" include the following:

1. Spell out the discipline code in the student handbook.
2. Support teachers consistently.
3. Provide swift punishment.
4. Provide punishment which does not discriminate among students.
5. Keep accurate records of the incident.
6. Involve the parent. A student who is sent home must return to school with parent.
7. Chronic offenders are sent to an "adjustment program".
8. Court cases are followed through.

The principles described imply a "no nonsense" attitude, which the author describes as being highly effective, although "eternal vigilance" is necessary in order to maintain the atmosphere.

It appears obvious from the sources reviewed above that there are widely varying opinions on the management style and function of the school principal.

Part of performing a management function involves the direct managing of discipline problems, which is considered a legitimate function of a principal by a number of writers (Wolcott, 1973; Saxe, 1968; Parody, 1965; Philadelphia School District, 1976; Vacca, 1971; Zanella, 1976). The general consensus among them is that the teacher has a right to expect assistance and support from the principal in matters of discipline when she has exhausted her resources in dealing with the problematic situation. To expect the principal to handle all or even most of the discipline in the school is unrealistic (Parody, 1965). He does not have a collection of techniques with which to break the wills of errant students, and many times sending the child to the principal only helps by giving the teacher some immediate relief from the tension of the situation.

Saxe (1968) suggests that "in schools where teachers feel impelled to handle discipline without referring cases to the office, a number of questionable practices may develop" (p. 27). Teachers may use punishment techniques as a last resort. Saxe suggests several actions to the principal in handling discipline problems. First, conduct an investigation of the problem. Listen to all sides of the problem so that feelings are expressed and those involved will feel understood and, therefore, more likely to accept the final decision in the handling of the case. Secondly, the matter may be settled by adjudication (punishment is imposed or restitution is required), by arbitration (in disputes between two or more students), or by negotiation (especially when parents are involved). In each case, the principal plays a major role.

Similarly, Vacca (1971) encourages principals to explore disciplinary incidents before levying punishment by asking questions such as:

> What was the infraction?
> How serious was the infraction?
> Was the student aware that a rule was being broken?
> What was the age of the student offender?
> What alternatives are available relative to punishment? (p. 405-406)

In this way, school disciplinary action can be particularized and, therefore, hopefully more "treatment than a retaliation."

Although the principal is the final authority for establishing rules of conduct, it is desirable that all concerned be allowed to have input into the discipline code (Carter, 1976; Philadelphia School District, 1976). Saxes (1968) comments on the principal's new interactional role in the schools:

> "... in his dealings with the students the principal needs to engage in a dialogue which will keep the lines of communication open. This obviously requires a pattern of behavior much different from that of the traditional principal. In his new role he must be approachable. The children must feel free to talk to him and to share their activities with him. They must see him, not as the master of their fate who metes out nonpromotions and punishment, but as a link through which their needs are made known to the school organization and through which communication is established with faculty, staff, and community." (p. 39)

The Teacher and Student Discipline

The teacher is clearly recognized as the central figure in the classroom; the teacher is responsible for establishing a climate that is conducive to learning, one that is responsive to the needs of the individual learner, and a climate that encourages and facilitates the total development of pupils. All of this should be orchestrated in an environment that is relatively free from elements that can detract from the learning process. The role of the classroom teacher in a desegregated setting becomes more complex in that often (s)he must establish such a classroom environment in spite of a conglomeration of negative factors associated with school desegregation.

The pre-existing attitude regarding desegregation that teachers bring to school can have significant impact on the climate that is ultimately established within the classroom. Such attitudes, if viewed negatively by pupils, may impede the accomplishment of specific learning tasks, activities, and goals. Green (1975) indicates that children from low socio-economic or urban communities are often confronted in the classroom by teachers who view them as intellectually deprived and unlikely to succeed. These initial attitudes could well determine the kinds of activities that are undertaken in the classroom and further hamper the development of positive student-teacher relations.

Teacher opinion of students and expectations for them may in fact affect subsequent student behaviors and achievement outcomes as described by Jacobsen and Rosenthal (1968). The importance of developing positive attitudes toward minority children is underscored by a number of educators (Niemeyer, 1966; Noar, 1974; Clark, 1965). It is recognized that such a process is critical for teachers who are to work in desegregated schools.

The problem associated with teaching in desegregated schools is further exacerbated when other factors such as middle class values and attitudes are considered. Much criticism has been directed toward the inability of middle class teachers to relate in a positive manner to minority students. Brophy (1974, p. 9) reporting on a study conducted by Rubovitz and Maehr described the results of an experimental micro teaching situation which involved 66 white female undergraduate prospective elementary teachers. "Each taught a lesson to a group of four racially mixed seventh or eighth grade students. On six of the eight measures of teacher-child interaction used, significant difference based on races was found." The teachers gave less attention to black students; they encouraged blacks to continue with an idea less frequently; they ignored a greater percentage of statements made by black students; and they praised black students less frequently and criticized them more. It has been found that teachers with positive attitudes toward integration had fewer discipline problems and required fewer discipline measures in their classrooms than teachers with negative attitudes (Peretti, 1975).

In a report edited by Johnson (1973) for the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Dorothy Clement cites (pp. 224-35) studies which indicate that institutional adjustment, or conformity to school rules and values, is an important factor in the formulation of teacher judgments.

A project report by Goulder (1971) stated that:

> The teachers' selection (for ability groupings) were not made on the basis of formal testing. We believe that the

> teachers based their decisions on a number of behavioral traits which they assumed to be predictive of "success." While we are not able to precisely identify all of these traits they appear to fall into three categories: (1) those indicating that the child, according to the teacher, is "teachable" or can learn, such as verbal skills and following directions; (2) those indicating that the child can adapt to bureaucratic school norms, such as being quiet, disciplined, neat and orderly; and (3) those indicating that the child might achieve middle-class goals, particularly those related to upward mobility, such as being from economically "better" homes, being submissive and polite and being able to defer gratifications (Goulder, 1971: 6).

Clements (p. 234) also cites Feshback's 1969 study which concluded that:

> The results provide striking support for the hypothesis that student teachers prefer pupils whose behavior reflects rigidity, conformity, and orderliness or dependency, passivity, and acquiescence more than pupils whose behavior is indicative of flexibility, non-conformity, and untidiness or independence, activity, and assertiveness (Feshback, 1969: 82).

Students who are new to particular school settings and students who experience a change in style and organization of the educational setting are likely to be perceived as maladjusted or disrespectful of the norms and expectations of the school; when, in fact, such students may have little or no knowledge regarding the new rules and expectations.

Faulk (1972) cites the teachers' lack of understanding of the students as a primary causal factor in most problems which occur in desegregated schools. He sees teacher attitudes as being "most critical", and attributes teacher lack of contact with blacks as a cause of problems and misunderstandings between teachers and black students.

Several other writers consider it to be essential to successful classroom interaction that teachers endeavor to understand their students (Noar, 1974; Shinn, 1971; Fuchs, 1969). Black and white teachers seem to view the problem of understanding differently. When a group of white teachers in a southern state were asked about their apprehensions toward black students, their answers reflected concerns relative to lack of understanding:

1. Lack of common grounds for understanding different styles, different values.
2. Understanding language, dialect; communication.
3. Overcoming their prejudices.
4. Planning for individual differences.
5. Lack of respect for adults.
6. Understanding their lack of interest.
7. Poor training of black students before integration.
8. Lack of training in the home.
9. Negro children downgrading themselves.
10. Fear of being prejudiced against them.
11. Defensiveness among students.
12. Profanity--vulgarity.
13. Lack of confidence in handling strictly racial problems.
14. Parental apathy.

When the black teachers were asked about their apprehensions toward white pupils, their responses centered around a concern for achieving true integration:

1. Trying to get the students to mix--getting them to be a whole class instead of separating themselves.
2. Helping some white children get rid of their feelings of superiority.
3. Getting them to feel they are a part of the class.
4. White parents are overly protective.
5. Trying to promote a feeling of a more relaxed atmosphere between the races (Buxton, Prichard, Bingham, Jackson, and Talps, 1974, p. 21 & 22).

Kron and Faber (1973) discuss a reaction which may be common among inexperienced teachers or teachers who have been transferred to schools of a different "sub-culture" than the one with which they are familiar. This reaction, which is termed "culture shock", is manifested by a number of symptoms, including "hysteria, weeping, (a) state of near collapse, depression, self-doubt, hostility ... fatigue, anger against strangers confronting one ... a frenzied retreat into the familiar ... (and) often, in addition, a feeling of helplessness and a desire for company for one's own kind" (Arensberg and Niehoff, as cited by Fuchs, 1969, 1. 21). Kron and Faber suggest that culture shock is common among teachers who have been transferred. The fact that individual teachers experience differing degrees of the malady suggests that some have more tolerance for unfamiliar situations, and, for a number of reasons, can adjust with less difficulty (Fuchs, 1969, p. 21).

A similar teacher reaction can be seen in desegregated classrooms. A white teacher from Indianapolis reported having feelings of "resentment" and "inadequacy" when her classroom was integrated (Giles, 1959, p. 74). Reports of teachers crying in their principal's offices are not uncommon (Orfield, 1976).

The sense of inadequacy felt by the teacher is further documented by Orfield (1976). He reports that often teachers face a "professional crisis" with the realization that they are not effective with children from backgrounds with which they are unfamiliar. He says that "when these 'good' teachers are confronted with large numbers of students who do not respond in the school's 'typical' way, they must either blame the newcomers or recognize and acknowledge a very serious professional inadequacy" (p. 318).

Lack of teacher acceptance of individual differences is evident in the existence of a status hierarchy among teachers which dictates that a teacher's status is determined by the type of student (and subject) which (s)he teaches (Uredevoe, 1967). Therefore, students of lower academic levels may indeed be resented by their teachers, and this condition could be a source of conflict within the student-teacher relationship. Orfield (1976) discusses a case study by Metz of three California schools which found that older teachers from schools that had been considered "high status" schools prior to desegregation seemed to have the greatest degree of difficulty in adjusting to desegregation. They expressed hostility over their perception that their "comfortable school (had been) invaded by strange children with no respect for their ideas of what a classroom should be like" (Metz, as cited in Orfield, 1976, p. 319).

One apprehension which many teachers have relative to classroom discipline is that of losing control of the students (Niemeyer, 1966, p. 14; Becker, 1952, p. 457). The point at which the students are considered to be "out of control" is defined by the teacher, and the student who goes beyond the arbitrarily determined point of control may be considered a "discipline problem" (Becker, 1952, p. 457). There appears to be some disagreement among teachers, as well as between students and teachers, as to what behaviors are considered to be serious problems (Rajpal, 1972; Mutimer, and Rosemier, 1967). Using a list which was developed by E.K. Wickman and administered to teachers and mental hygienists in 1928, Rajpal (1972) had 100 teachers and 20 school psychologists rate the degree of seriousness of 50 student behaviors on a seven point scale, Multimer and Rosemier used the same instrument and administered it to 40 teachers and 911 students in 1967. Among the top ten offenses which were listed as being most serious, the 1967 and 1972 groups of teachers agreed on stealing, destruction of school property, lying, cheating, cruelty and bullying, and unreliableness, and being easily discouraged; but they disagreed on such behaviors as being unhappy, truancy, being unsocial, disobedience, obscene notes/talk, and impertinence. It might be concluded that the behaviors in the first group are, for the most part, offenses which are widely recognized as being socially deviant, whereas the offenses in the second group appear to be more a matter of personal preference or judgment.

A study conducted by Robert Stebbins (1970) sought to obtain information on teacher definitions of disorderly conduct. Stebbins found that, for teachers included in the study, reaction to disruption was based not only on consideration of the behavior, but upon "some identification of the students involved in terms of the level of their past academic performance and deportment" (Stebbins, 1970:

223). Because the teacher's evaluation of and reaction to various behaviors is dependent, in part, upon the classroom activity, the teacher's academic success expectations of the student, and the teacher's behavioral expectations of the student, the same type of behavior may be evaluated differently and receive different responses.

While differential evaluation of and responses to student behavior may occur for the same behavior, the possibility for misinterpretation of behavior enhances the probability of certain students receiving negative teacher evaluations and reactions. Rosenfield (1971) describes problem situations arising from cultural differences and conflicts between the student/home and teacher/school cultures. Rosenfeld suggests that student movement in the classroom may be related to the home inspired orientation to space. Lower-class students who live in relatively smaller environments may indeed feel isolated when confined to a desk which is to remain separated from the other desks in the classroom.

The process of learning to cope and perhaps change attitudes among teachers has been and continues to be a slow one. Justin (1972) reported on an attitude questionnaire administered to teachers in Palm Beach, Florida, who were being transferred to other schools as a means of achieving racial balance. He concluded that although some were making efforts to support meaningful integration, "racial prejudice is very much alive in the minds of hundreds of school teachers" (p. 92). Grossman, Clark, Lowenherz, and Pugh (1971) report on an attempt to promote mutual understanding between children from urban classrooms and student teachers by having them meet weekly, followed by open discussion meetings among student teachers and a clinic staff member. The result was that the group discussions "revealed that students possess little respect for anybody who is obviously poor, in need of help; or worst of all, is getting help through public funds" (p. 490). The writers concluded that if future teachers hold the type of beliefs and feelings regarding some children which were exposed in the discussion groups, "there is cause to wonder how even our good teachers can be effective when their heads are trying to help while their guts are tied into knots of anger, disgust, and resentment" (p. 490).

Students somehow sense how their teachers view them, as was seen in a report by the Commission on Civil Rights (undated): "Students respond well when they ... are liked and respected by the teachers. Racist views or middle class contempt for lower socio-economic groups almost absolutely obstruct communication and destroy the changes for effective teaching" (p. 8).

The teacher plays a crucial role in providing for the academic and social success of the student in the desegregated school setting. Factors which determine the success of the teacher include the abilities to curtail personal prejudices, to understand and accept cultural differences, and to express a sensitivity toward the needs of all students.

The teacher who experiences difficulty in dealing with the desegregated classroom setting because of racial prejudice or personal rigidity provides an atmosphere conducive to disruptive behavior and disrespect on the part of the students.

The students' attitudes toward administrators, teachers, classmates, and the desegregation process in general also play an important role in the quality of the desegregated classroom environment.

The teacher-student relationship is perhaps the most important aspect of the successfully desegregated school program. Attitudes of racial prejudice on the part of teachers and students, failure or refusal of school personnel to recognize curricular needs of students, and disregard for the insecurities prompted by the desegregation process contribute to negative behavior responses, and a school setting that is non-conducive to learning.

The limited review presented herein, though not intended to be inclusive, does indeed suggest that other factors may contribute to the current student suspension problem in Jefferson County. It has been determined that a careful study of teacher and administrative behavior should be undertaken to ascertain the extent to which behaviors of these individuals contribute to and perpetuate student discipline problems and suspensions.

SECTION II

METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

Project Design and Procedures

This project has been designed for execution in two phases. Phase I will address data collection in order to answer the questions posed within the work plan (see below). Phase II will be concerned with the development of effective methods and materials remediating the problem areas that have been indicated by Phase I.

1.0 Question

1.01 Do teachers in schools with high suspension rates exhibit more directing and restricting behaviors toward students than do teachers in schools with low suspension rates?

1.02 Are there inconsistencies apparent in the verbal and nonverbal communication patterns of teachers?

1.03 Do teachers tend to react differentially to students on the basis of ethnicity or gender?

1.1 Objectives

1.11 To determine the proportions of indirect/direct and encouraging/restricting behaviors exhibited by teachers in teacher/student interactions.

1.12 To determine if there are significant differences in the verbal and/or nonverbal behaviors of teachers in schools with high and low suspension rates.

1.13 To identify and isolate any apparent inconsistencies between the verbal and nonverbal communication patterns of teachers.

1.14 To determine whether there are any observable differences in teacher reactions to students when analyzed by ethnicity/gender.

1.2 Strategy

1.21 A sample of ten schools will be drawn from the 25 secondary schools; five with high rates of suspension and five with low rates.

1.22 From the pool of teachers of required ninth-grade classes a sample of ten will be drawn in each of the ten schools.

1.23 Each teacher will be observed in the classroom setting by a trained adult observer, utilizing an appropriate instrument for recording teacher/student interactions.

1.24 Data derived from observations will be analyzed with appropriate statistical tests.

1.25 Suspension data for each of the ten schools will be utilized for comparisons with observational data.

1.3 Tasks

1.31 Complete total design of study.

1.32 Select schools, secure staff approval and orientate participants.

1.33 Execute informal consent from participants (if required).

1.34 Select appropriate instruments.

1.35 Employ five observers.

1.36 Train observers and establish interrater reliability.

1.37 Desensitize Ss through onsite visits.

1.38 Develop observation schedules for observers.

1.39 Onsite observations.

1.4 Population

1.41 NA

1.42 Ten of the 25 secondary schools.

1.43 One hundred teachers selected into the sample.

1.44 NA

1.45 Graduate students or substitute teachers.

1.46 Same as 1.45.

1.47 S teachers and classes.

1.48 Observers and Ss.

1.49 Same as 1.48

1.5 Implementation

1.51 Staff.

1.52 Staff and appropriate school staff.

1.53 Staff.

1.54 Staff.

1.55 Staff.

1.56 Staff.

1.57 Observers and staff.

1.58 Research analyst.

1.59 Observers with staff support.

1.6 Data Collection

1.61 NA

1.62 Suspension data from 1977-78.

1.63 NA

1.64 Evaluation of available instruments.

1.65 Vitae and applications.

1.66 Observer ratings on instruments.

1.67 NA

1.68 School calendars and teaching schedules.

1.69 Observation and recording.

1.7 Sources of Data

1.71 NA

1.72 Pupil Personnel Office.

1.73 Ss

1.74 Body of available instruments.

1.75 Universities and Personnel Office.

1.76 Observer performance.

1.77 NA

1.78 Appropriate district and school staff.

1.79 Classes taught by Ss.

1.8 Data Analysis

1.81 NA

1.82 Ranking of schools by suspension rates.

1.83 NA

1.84 Suitability for this study.

1.85 Personal interviews after screening.

1.86 Appropriate correlational tests.

1.87 NA

1.88 NA

1.89 As determined by overall design.

2.0 Question

2.01 Does the interpretation and administration of the rules system impact teachers' responses to disciplinary problems within the classroom?

2.02 Does administrative technique to accomplish communication, management and decision-making vary for high schools with high and low suspension rates?

2.03 Do teacher perceptions of administrative technique vary from behavior reported by principals?

2.04 Do student perceptions of administrative technique vary from behavior reported by principals?

2.05 Does administrative perception of discretion to suspend by offense correlate with the ratio of black/white suspensions by offense?

2.1 Objectives

2.11 To determine teacher perceptions of administrative expectations relative to discipline problems in the classroom.

2.12 To determine the various means by which these administrative functions are accomplished, and if these methods vary for schools with high and low suspension rates.

2.13 To determine the difference between teacher perceptions of administrative behavior and behavior reported by principals in schools with high and low suspension (validation) rates.

2.14 To determine the difference between student perceptions of administrative behavior and behavior reported by principals in schools with high and low suspension (validation) rates.

2.15 To determine the relationship between administrative discretion to suspend a student for a certain offense and ratios of black/white suspensions by offense.

2.2 Strategy

2.21 Sample identified in 1.22 will be surveyed.

2.22 All secondary principals and assistant principals will be surveyed to determine reported behavior for accomplishing communication, management, and decision-making.

2.23 Items parallel to those in survey under 2.21 will be included on teacher questionnaire.

2.24 Items parallel to those in survey under 2.21 will be included on student questionnaire.

2.25 Principals will be asked to rank degree of discretion involved in decision to suspend by offense.

2.3 Tasks

2.31 Develop teacher survey instrument to answer questions 2.01 and 2.03.

2.32 Develop administrator survey instrument to answer questions 2.02 and 2.05.

2.33 Develop items for student survey.

2.4 Population

2.41 Teacher sample as described in 1.22 and 1.43.

2.42 Principals and assistant principals in the five high suspension schools and five low suspension schools.

2.43 Students in selected classes of teachers included in observation sample.

2.5 Implementation

2.51 Staff.

2.52 Staff.

2.53 Staff.

2.6 Data Collection

2.61 Survey teachers.

2.62 Survey principals.

2.63 Survey students.

2.7 Sources of Data

2.71 Same as 1.22

2.72 All secondary principals and assistant principals.

2.73 All students in sample classes, 100 classes x 30 students.

2.8 Data Analysis

2.81 Factor analysis to isolate factors within instrument, discriminant analysis between high and low schools, and t-tests using various combinations of the independent variables race, sex and high-low.

2.82 Factor analysis to isolate factors within instrument, discriminant analysis between high and low schools, and t-tests using various combinations of the independent variables race, sex and high-low.

2.83 Factor analysis to isolate factors within instrument, discriminant analysis between high and low schools, and t-tests using various combinations of the independent variables race, sex and high-low.

3.0 Question

3.01 Do the results of student observations of teacher behavior correlate with those of adult observers?

3.02 What are student perceptions of administrative techniques related to discipline?

3.1 Objectives

3.11 To determine from student surveys whether students and adult observers have similar perceptions of classroom interactions.

3.12 To determine whether students feel that administrative disciplinary techniques are effective or ineffective.

3.2 Strategy

3.21 Survey students in Ss classes, utilizing the same information domains as the instrument used by observers.

3.22 Compare data from the student survey and the observational instruments.

3.23 Survey students in Ss classes, by school, to assess their perceptions of administrative techniques related to student discipline.

3.3 Tasks

3.31 Design survey instrument based on the observation instrument.

3.32 Administer instrument to students in sample classes.

3.33 Test for correlations between student survey results and results of observational instrument analysis.

3.34 Incorporate into same instrument under 3.31 measures of student perceptions of administrative disciplinary techniques.

3.35 (Same as 3.32).

3.36 Analyze surveys for student response.

3.4 Population

3.41 NA

3.42 All students in sample classes 100 classes x 30 students = 3000 (approximate)

3.43 Same as 3.42.

3.44 Same as 3.42.

3.45 Same as 3.42.

3.46 Same as 3.42.

3.5 Implementation

3.51 Staff.

3.52 Staff and observers.

3.53 Staff.

3.54 Staff.

3.55 NA

3.56 Staff.

3.6 Data Collection

3.61 Administered and collected by observers.

3.62 Analyzed by staff.

3.7 Sources of Data

3.71 All students in sample classes.

3.8 Data Analysis

3.82 Factor analysis to isolate appropriate factors, discriminant analysis between high and low schools, t-tests using various combinations of the independent variables race, sex, and high-low.

Population

Sampling Procedures

Schools

Ten schools were selected for the study from among the twenty-five secondary schools in the Jefferson County Public School System. The sole selection criteria for the ten schools was based on the suspension rates for each school. Five of the ten schools had the highest suspension rates and five had the lowest suspension rates within the Jefferson County system. Selection decisions were based on suspension data for the 1977-78 school year.

It was necessary to reduce the sample of schools from ten to eight. Reasons for this reduction are explained in the Limitations of Study section. Therefore, the following is descriptive of four high suspension schools and four low suspension schools.

Administrators

The principals from the four high suspension and four low suspension schools constituted the focus of administrative behavior. From these schools a total of 7 principals and 16 assistant principals participated in the study. Of this number (N = 23) 19 (82.6%) were white males, 0 (0.0%) were white females, 4 (17.4%) were black males, and 0 (0.0%) were black females.

Teachers

All teachers were selected on the basis of a ninth grade assignment in science, English, or mathematics. Within the ninth grade context, ten teachers were randomly selected in each participating school. Following teacher selection, class period for observation was also randomly selected from each teacher's ninth grade class schedule. All teachers selected for study participated with the following exceptions; one (1) teacher was replaced due to illness, two (2) teachers were replaced due to schedule change, two (2) teachers were dropped due to incomplete observations consequent to teacher illness, four (4) teachers (from one high suspension school) were dropped due to refusal to participate.

Of the completed observations (N = 74), 32 (44%) of the teachers were white male, 29 (38.7%) were white female, 4 (5.3%) were black male, and 9 (12%) were black female. In terms of subject area, 30 (40%) of the observations were in English classes, 28 (38.7%) were in math, and 16 (21.3%) were in science. Scheduled period of the day for the observed classes was as follows: 17 (22.7%) in period I, 11 (16%) in period II, 13 (17.3%) in period III, 11 (14.7%) in period IV, 12 (16%) in period V, and 10 (13.3%) in period VI.

Students

Participation of students in the study was automatic, consequent to selection of their teacher for class observation. As such, a few students appear more than once within the student sample population.

Of the participating students (N = 1634) 597 (36.5%) were white male, 537 (32.9%) were white female, 259 (15.9%) were black male, and 241 (14.7%) were black female.

Data Sources

Data were gathered in the 8 schools between November, 1978 and February, 1979. Methods for gathering this data were classroom observation and questionnaires. In addition, suspension data for the 1978-79 school year was drawn from a computer tape furnished by the Jefferson County Public School System's Office of Information.

Classroom Observation

Technique

The classroom observation instrument used in this study was the IDER System (Indirect/Direct - Encouraging/Restricting) developed by Russell French and Charles Galloway at Ohio State University in 1967.

The system is predicated on the Flanders Classroom Interaction Scale which measures the quantity and sequential patterning of teacher-student interaction based on 10 well defined behavior categories. In addition to this quantitative measure, the IDER System measures the positive and negative affect that accompanies the verbal transaction. In adopting the instrument to this study provision was made to capture the race and sex of the students involved in each transaction.

Thus, the system as used in this study describes all the interaction (positive or negative, verbal and non-verbal) involving the teacher and the student that takes place during the observation period. Teachers were observed for five consecutive days in the same classroom for the entire period. Interactions were recorded every five seconds. All teacher data is cumulative and based on the total of all observations.

Observers

The observers were five substitute teachers from within the Jefferson County System. All five of the observers were certified elementary teachers. Four of the observers were white females and one was a white male. All participants were chosen subsequent to interview. Attempts were made to obtain sex/race balance among observers. One black female was hired, but resigned during the observer training session due to a teaching opportunity in another city. Four of the five observers, who averaged approximately 29 years of age, were from outside the state and had not been part of the Jefferson

County System previous to the 1978-79 school year. Each observer was assigned one high suspension school and one low suspension school. None of the observers, however, was aware of the criterion of school selection or the overall goals of the study. During the course of observations one observer was hospitalized. Her observations were finished by another observer.

Training

Training took place over a period of approximately two weeks. Dr. Russell French, one of the developers of the observation system, worked with the observers for two and one-half days. This was followed by several days of practice with tapes and materials supplied by Dr. French.

Interrater reliability was established by having the observers record observation for the same classes in a school not involved in the study. Interrator reliability was found to be .87 and was obtained by computing the correlations between each of the observers and averaging them.

Observer Commentary

Each observer was asked to keep a written daily log concerning personal feelings and reactions to events within the schools. In addition, each observer was asked to give written reactions to differences between his/her two schools. To facilitate this, a nominal group process was used to establish possible topics that discriminated between the schools. Each observer was subsequently asked to write an essay addressing what he/she felt were the areas of difference between schools. At this point, however, observers were unaware of the criterion for selection of the individual schools.

Development of Instrument

The items on the questionnaire were addressed to various qualities of administrative behavior as well as the general quality of school atmosphere. Though an extensive search was conducted in attempt to find an existing instrument that was appropriate for the project, none could be found. Consequently, it was necessary to develop an instrument specifically for this study. In developing the instrument, special consideration was given to the qualities of administrative behavior discussed in the literature review of this report (Section I, pp. 7-21). Items were constructed to measure the qualities in the following categories; Leadership, Mediation-Facilitation, Discipline, Decision Making, and School Climate. The questionnaire was administered to the principals and assistant principals of the 8 schools and to the teachers and students participating in the study. Items on the administrator and teacher questionnaires were identical, but the administrator questionnaire contained an additional section of thirty questions about the suspension process. A special instrument using appropriately phrased items was developed for students. The items on the student questionnaire were parallel to the items on the administrator/teacher instrument.

The administrator/teacher instrument was reviewed for construct validity and item appropriateness by a panel of administrators. It was subsequently field tested on a population of middle school administrators. The student instrument was reviewed by several principals and field tested on a population of students in a school not included in the study. The emphasis in this review and field test was item clarity and appropriate vocabulary.

In addition, a special section was included in the student instrument. This section examined those issues of teacher/student interaction addressed by the IDER observation. It was felt that by definition, data gathered via observation was temporally circumscribed. Thus, the information gathered by this method could be inaccurate relative to the entire school year. The student experience in the classroom, however, is cumulative, in that the students' perceptions describe classroom behavior for the entire quarter rather than the observation period. Subsequent to consultation with Drs. Truman Whitfield and Russell French, questions were developed that paralleled the observation criteria being used by the classroom observers. The purpose of such items was to examine whether student perceptions of classroom interaction were coincident with the IDER observer reports.

Administration of Questionnaire

Administrators received and completed the questionnaire prior to the beginning of the observation period. Students and teachers were administered the questionnaire at the end of the observation period for each individual class. The teacher was not present when the questionnaire was being completed, but was in another part of the building completing his/her questionnaire.

Limitations of Study

Original plans called for a sample size of ten schools. Data collection problems, however, were created when one observer's reliability was found to be quite low. Due to these data collection problems, two schools (one high suspension school and one low suspension school), were eliminated, reducing the sample size to eight schools.

The classroom observations were made during the period from December 1978 to March 1979. Therefore, the observation schedule was frequently interrupted because of school cancellation due to inclement weather.

Illness also adversely affected observation schedule continuity. The illness of teachers and observers occasionally interrupted the observation schedule. A combination of illness and snow days made it necessary to make the final observation of several individual classrooms on a "catch as can" basis.

Due to the random selection of the teacher sample, full cooperation was essential in order to assure a truly representative sample. Faculty and administration cooperation was excellent except for one high suspension school where four teachers refused to participate and were not replaced in the observation population.

Since the observers were certified teachers, they may have been desensitized to certain classroom phenomena. Classroom situations or activities could possibly have escaped the observers notice because of his/her experiences in the classroom environment. There would appear to be considerable potential for identification with the teacher by the observer. Consequently, observers objectivity and/or perception might have been affected.

The non-verbal components of the observations were quite difficult to quantify. Though care was taken in observer selection and training, the difficulty of recognizing and categorizing non-verbal behavior was anticipated as an area of difficulty.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical data displayed in this report are the result of analysis of questionnaire data, classroom observation, and suspension data. Suspension data were provided by the Jefferson County School District's Office of Information.

Data was processed primarily on the University of Kentucky's IBM 370 Computer in Lexington, Kentucky. The crosstabulations for the classroom observation data wereprocessed by the University of Tennessee's IBM 370 Computer. The data processed at the University of Kentucky was analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) Computer Package (Barr et.al., 1977) while the data processed at the University of Tennessee used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et.al., 1975) Computer package.

Statistical Analysis - Questionnaire

The analysis of the questionnaire data was done by criterion groups (i.e. administrators, teachers, and students). Factor analysis was done to verify pre-established scales (Leadership, Mediator-Facilitator, etc.) and to determine item loading within the pre-established scales. Subsequently, discriminant analysis was done on these factors to determine if there was a consistent pattern of response.

In addition, parametric and non-parametric tests were conducted on individual items and factors. Parametric tests were analysis of variance and t-tests. Independent variables manipulated were high/low suspension criterion, race, and sex. The non-parametric test used was a sign test.

Definition of Terms

Climate	- Refers to the tone and quality of the individual school environment created by the interactions of members of the school community.
High-suspension schools	- Refers to the five schools in the sample of schools within the high suspension rate criterion group.
Jefferson County Discipline Code	- Refers to a uniform set of rules and guidelines developed by the Jefferson County Public System to govern student conduct within the schools.
Low-suspension schools	- Refers to the five schools in the sample of schools within the low suspension rate criterion group.
Non-verbal interaction	- Refers to those inter-personal communications in which no words are spoken, but information is conveyed via gestures, facial expression, etc.
Suspension rate	- Refers to the total number of suspensions within a school in comparison with the population of the school.
Direct Influence	- Transactions in which the teacher exerts a direct verbal influence on the student. These transactions fall into three categories: (1) Lecture - giving facts or opinions about content or procedure, expressing his/her own idea, asking rhetorical questions; (2) Giving directions - directions, commands, or orders with which a student is expected to comply; (3) Criticizes or justifies authority - statements intended to change student behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern, justification of teacher behavior. (Throughout this report the term Direct Behavior is used interchangeably with Direct Influence)

Indirect Influence - Transactions in which the teacher exerts an indirect verbal influence on the student. These transactions fall into four categories: (1) Accepts feelings - accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a non-threatening manner; (2) Praises or encourages - praises or encourages student action on behavior; (3) Accepts or uses ideas of students - clarifying, building, or developing ideas or suggestions by a student; (4) Asks questions - asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answers. (Throughout this report the term Indirect Behavior is used interchangeably with Indirect Influence)

IO - Indirect Objective Behavior - Student perceptions of teacher indirect behavior manifested toward the class.

DO - Direct Objective Behavior - Student perceptions of teacher direct behavior manifested toward the class.

IP - Indirect Personal Behavior - Student perceptions of teacher indirect behavior manifested toward them as individuals within the class.

DP - Direct Personal Behavior - Student perceptions of teacher direct behavior manifested toward them as individuals within the class.

SECTION III

FINDINGS

FINDINGS

The data presented in this section result from several data collection and analysis procedures that are outlined in Section II p. 33 . In some instances different analytic procedures were applied to the same set of data in order to confirm initial findings. As described in Section II p. 33 , efforts were made to structure all data collection devices so that comparisons could be made between low and high suspension schools. The focus of the entire study was the identification of factors that differentiate low and high suspension schools. A description of data analysis and findings follows in this section.

Question 1.01 Do teachers in schools with high suspension rates exhibit more directing and restricting behaviors toward students than do teachers in schools with low suspension rates?

Directing Behavior

The findings in this section are based on the Indirect-Direct ratios computed from observer data. There were too few tallies in the Encouraging-Restricting measure to permit any meaningful analysis.

Analysis of interactions focused on the subset of low and high suspension schools as well as individual teachers. Some differences in teacher behavior were expected, within an individual school or within subsets of the school sample.

Composite ID ratios for teachers in the low and high suspension samples were analyzed with the Mann-Whitney test. A z-score of .93 was the result of this analysis, and is not significant. Based on comparisons of ID ratios, no significant differences were observed between teachers in low and high suspension schools.

Data from which the ID ratios were computed, were recorded with appropriate race/sex codes of those students involved in the interaction. This procedure permitted the computation of ID ratios, reflecting the interactions with various combinations of male/female and black/white variables.

Possible differences in the Indirect-Direct ratios were examined on the variables of race, high/low, and the interaction of race and high/low. This was done using t-tests. Each test, however, failed to demonstrate any significant differences. T-values obtained for each test were as follows: Race - t = .695 (df=68), High/Low - t = .446 (df=68), and race x high/low interaction - t = .8525 (df=68).

From analysis of observation data there seemed to be no difference in the directing behavior of teachers between low and high suspension schools.

Question 1.02 Are there inconsistencies apparent in the verbal and nonverbal communication patterns of teachers?

Nonverbal Interactions

The recorded nonverbal interactions were insufficient to permit data analysis, so that no findings are available from observation data. However, the student survey included comparable items covering the nonverbal dimension of classroom interactions. Significant differences were apparent in the analysis of student responses to nonverbal dimension items. These items were t-tested on the variables of race, sex, and high/low. One item was significant at the .05 level on the sex variable; #26 - When students discuss or ask questions in class, the teacher listens very carefully. Females were more positive than males on this item.

Table 1 displays the items that were significant at the .05 level on the race variable.

Table 1 Student Responses by Race on Nonverbal Dimension

Item #	
19	The teacher shows that he/she cares about how students feel by a pat on the back, a wink, a smile, or something like that.
20	The teacher shows that he/she likes what students do with smiles or other friendly gestures.
22	I feel that the teacher's questions are directed to me because he/she looks at me and moves near me when asking a question.
23	When the teacher is talking to us, he/she knows when we are tired or bored.

White students were more positive on items 19, 20, and 22, while black students were more positive on item 23.

The following table lists the items that were significant on the variable of high/low ($p < .05$).

Table 2 Student Responses by High/Low on Nonverbal Dimension

Item #	
19	The teacher shows that he/she cares about how students feel by a pat on the back, a wink, a smile, or something like that.
20	The teacher shows that he/she likes what students do with smiles or other friendly gestures.
21	The teacher shows that he/she likes our ideas by the looks on his/her face, or a nod, or something like that.
23	When the teacher is talking to us, he/she knows when we are tired or bored.
24	Even when the teacher tells us what to do or how to do it, he/she seems to be very interested in us. His/her face shows it.

Responses of students in low suspension schools were more positive on all of these nonverbal items. The variables of race and high/low appear to provide more differentiation on the nonverbal dimension than does the sex variable.

One item in the survey specifically asked whether the teachers' verbal and nonverbal behaviors were consistent. There was no significant difference on the item by any of the combination of variables.

Question 1.03 Do teachers tend to react differentially to students on the basis of ethnicity or gender?

Observation Data

Analysis of the observation data on the race, sex, and high/low variables resulted in no significant differences in teachers' interactions with students.

Student Survey

A series of t-tests on individual items on the sex variable resulted in significance on the items in Table 3.

Table 3 Significant Items ($p < .05$) on the Variable of Sex

Item #	
2	The teacher is interested in how I feel about things.
3	The teacher says nice things about what students do well.
4	The teacher says nice things about what I do well.
6	The teacher uses my thoughts and feelings in explaining the class work.
8	During the class the teacher directs questions to me.
10	The teacher spends a lot of time telling us what to do and how to do it.
11	The teacher spends a lot of time telling me what to do and how to do it.
12	The teacher spends a lot of time telling students what they do wrong.
13	The teacher spends a lot of time telling me what I do wrong.

Females responded more positively than males on all nine items in Table 3. These items included the personal and group perspectives of the students; i.e., in some instances the item relates to the individual student interaction, and in other instances to the teachers' reactions to the class as a group.

Another series of t-tests were done on the race variable. The results of the analysis are in Table 4.

Table 4 Significant Items ($p < .05$) on the Variable of Race

Item #	
1	The teacher is interested in how students feel about things.
2	The teacher is interested in how I feel about things.
5	The teacher uses the thoughts and feelings of the students in explaining the class work.
6	The teacher uses my thoughts and feelings in explaining the class work.
8	During the class the teacher directs questions to me.
11	The teacher spends a lot of time telling me what to do and how to do it.
13	The teacher spends a lot of time telling me what I do wrong.
18	There are times when nothing is going on in the class.

There was a split in student responses by race; white students were more positive on items 1, 11, 13, and 18. Black students were more positive on items 2, 5, 6, and 8.

A final series of t-tests were run on the high/low variable for individual items. Significant t-values were attained on items 1, 2, 3, 8, and 18 (See Tables 3 and 4). The responses of students in low suspension schools were more positive on four of the five items; i.e., 1, 2, 3, and 18. Students in high suspension schools were more positive on item 8.

Apparently, from the students' perspective, there is some tendency for teachers to react differentially to students on the basis of sex. There is also a difference in the responses of students in low and high suspension schools. Differential reaction to students on the basis of race doesn't seem to be in evidence, based on student responses.

Question 2.01 Does the interpretation and administration of the rules system impact teachers' responses to disciplinary problems within the classroom?

Question 2.03 Do teacher perceptions of administrative technique vary from behavior reported by principals?

Factor Analysis - Teacher Survey

The questionnaire administered to teachers consisted of 55 items comprising five scales in the areas of Leadership, Mediation-Facilitation, Discipline, Decision-making, and Climate. These areas of administrative behavior were suggested in the review of previous research (Sec. I p. 7).

Useable questionnaires were returned by 70 teachers in the eight subject schools. These included 38 from low suspension schools and 32 from high suspension schools. A factor analysis (varimax rotation) was done on the 55 items comprising the above mentioned scales. The factor analysis yielded eight factors. Scales were successfully reduced to single factors in three cases. The results appear in Table 5. Final rotated factor matrices are in Appendix A.

Table 5 Teacher Subscales Derived From Factor Analysis of 55 Items

Leadership		
Factor	I-A	Style of leadership
Factor	I-B	Role of principal in planning school structure
Factor	I-C	Style of management
Mediation-Facilitation		
Factor	II	Principal's role as mediator-facilitator
Discipline		
Factor	III-A	Student as the focus of the school
Factor	III-B	Rule enforcement
Decision-making		
Factor	IV	Principal's style of decision making
Climate		
Factor	V	Climate

Discriminant Analysis

A discriminant analysis was done utilizing the eight factors yielded from the factor analysis. Results of the discriminant analysis are displayed in Table 6. A percentage $\leq$ 60.00 is to be considered a significant accuracy of classification.

Table 6 Discriminant Analysis for Teachers
in Low and High Suspension Schools

	Low	High
Low	*93.10	6.90
High	30.43	69.57
	**(55.47)	(44.23)

*Underlined indicates percent of correct classification

**Prior probabilities

The results of the discriminant analysis indicate that teachers in low and high suspension schools responded very differently to the survey. They were accurately classified into low and high suspension categories based on the eight factors. Accuracy of classification was greater for those teachers in low suspension schools, with their responses being more homogeneous.

Analysis of Variance

In order to clarify apparent differences in the responses of teachers, analysis of variance was utilized with individual item responses as dependent variables. High/low suspension rate, black/white, and male/female were the independent variables. ANOVA tables are in Appendix B.

Table 7

Significant Items ($p < .05$) for High/Low Main Effect

Item #	
8	The principal is seen in the halls and cafeteria interacting with students and staff. p = .008
12	The principal is the driving force in this school. p = .007
23	The principal attempts to deal with potential problem situations before a major problem develops. p = .05
25	The principal is sympathetic to the needs of teachers. p = .05
34	The principal is supportive of the teacher in discipline situations. p = .05
50	In this school students have respect for the teachers. p - .02
51	People are honest and sincere in this school. p = .01
52	Students find this school to be an enjoyable experience. p = .04
53	In this school students are not afraid of other students. p = .05
54	Students feel welcomed and accepted at this school. p = .01
55	The school provides a good learning environment. p = .04

The results of t-testing of individual items between high and low suspension schools confirm the ANOVA results. Teachers in high suspension schools responded more positively on three of the 11 items, while those in low suspension schools were more positive on the remaining eight items ($p < .05$). Climate items comprised six of the 11 items on which significant differences were found, with teachers in low suspension schools responding more positively on all six climate items. Items 12, 23, and 25 elicited a more positive response from teachers in high suspension schools, while items 8, 34, and 50-55 were more positively responded to be teachers in low suspension schools.

There was a total of 13 items on which High/Low x Sex interactions were significant ($p < .05$). These are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8 Significant Items ($p < .05$) for High/Low x Sex Interaction

Item #	
12	The principal is the driving force in this school. $p = .05$
13	The school's goals and objectives are clear. $p = .007$
14	The school moves toward accomplishment of its goals and objectives. $p = .001$
16	The principal encourages new ideas from students. $p = .01$
17	The principal elicits output and production from school personnel. $p = .05$
21	The principal waits to hear the facts in a case before making a decision. $p = .05$
25	The principal is sympathetic to the needs of teachers. $p = .05$
26	The principal makes every effort to understand concerns of the student. $p = .05$
27	The principal is receptive to constructive criticism concerning his/her performance as an administrator. $p = .03$
47	When a student has a problem, it is easy to find help. $p = .02$
48	In this school, teachers respect the students. $p = .002$
50	In this school, students have respect for the teachers. $p = .05$
55	The school provides a good learning environment. $p = .02$

A series of t-tests were done over these items. Females in low suspension schools responded more positively on 11 of the 13 items, (14-55) while males in high suspension schools responded more positively on items 12 and 13 ($p < .05$). The results of the ANOVA and t-tests were consistent over all items.

Significant differences were apparent in the responses of teachers in low and high suspension schools. This was confirmed by the results of discriminant analysis, analysis of variance, and t-testing. The clustering of climate items indicated that this was an important factor in differentiating low and high suspension schools.

Differing responses between male and female teachers in low and high suspension schools were apparent. Males in high suspension schools tended to respond favorably to principal characteristics that were indicative of decisiveness in decision-making. Females in low suspension schools were more positive than any other group toward those administrative behaviors that impacted on overall school climate.

Question 2.02 Does administrative technique to accomplish communication, management, and decision-making vary for high schools with high and low suspension rates?

Factor Analysis - Administrator Survey

The self-reporting questionnaires administered to administrators, teachers, and students, included 55 items that were common to administrators and teachers. These items were subsumed under five scales that attempted to measure administrative behavior in the areas of Leadership, Mediation-Facilitation, Discipline, Decision-making, and Climate. A review of the literature suggested that these administrative behaviors have significant impact on student behavior, directly and/or indirectly (See Sec. I p. 7).

Useable questionnaires were returned by 23 administrators in the eight subject schools. A factor analysis (varimax rotation) was done on the 55 items comprising the above-mentioned scales. The factor analysis yielded 14 factors that were grouped as subscales of the five initial scales. The results appear in Table 9. Final rotated factor matrices are in Appendix A.

Table 9 Administrator Subscales Derived from Factor Analysis of 55 Items

Leadership

Factor	I-A	Visibility of the principal
Factor	I-B	Authority figures within the school
Factor	I-C	Human relations skills
Factor	I-D	Co-curricular emphasis of the school
Factor	I-E	Authority exercised by principal

Mediation-Facilitation

Factor	II-A	Principal decision making criterion
Factor	II-B	Principal's management of the environment

Discipline

Factor	III-A	Principal-student relations
Factor	III-B	Rule enforcement
Factor	III-C	Principal's fairness in discipline

Decision-Making

Factor	IV	Principal's style of decision-making

Climate

Factor	V-A	Staff-student mutual respect
Factor	V-B	Evaluation of attitude toward environment
Factor	V-C	Student as the focus of the school

Discriminant Analysis

A discriminant analysis was done utilizing the 14 factors representing the respective subscales. Results of the analysis are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10 Discriminant Analysis for Administrators in Low and High Suspension Schools

	Low	High
Low	*90.00	10.00
High	0.00	100.00
	**(52.63)	(47.37)

*Underlined indicates percent of correct classification

**Prior probabilities

Administrators were very accurately classified based on the 14 factors. There was a marked difference in administrative technique between low and high suspension schools, as reported by this sample of administrators.

t-tests

A series of t-tests was done on the 55 individual items to determine specific differences in administrator responses. Significant difference ($p < .05$) was found on four of the items. The items and p values are as follows:

Item 57 - The principal is receptive to constructive criticism concerning his/her performance as an administrator. p .006

Item 58 - The principal effectively balances community pressure with realities of school operation. p .02

Item 72 - The principal solicits input from many sources when problems and needs present themselves. p .02

Item 78 - In this school teachers respect the students. p .01

Administrators in high suspension schools responded more positively on items 57, 58, and 72, while those in low suspension schools responded more positively on item 78. There was perfect agreement between administrators in low and high suspension schools on item 64; the principal is supportive of the teacher in discipline situations.

Administrators in high suspension schools reached perfect agreement on two items; item 35 - the principal takes primary responsibility for overall operation of the school, and item 51 - the principal waits to hear the facts in a case before making a decision. Those in low suspension schools agreed perfectly on one item; item 63 - students being disciplined are judged by the facts in the case rather than by reputation.

Sign tests

Sign tests were done on all items to discern any trends in responses, with the following results:

1. Administrators in high suspension schools tended to respond more positively to items 31 - 74 than those in low schools (p = .999). These items correspond to factors I-A through IV.
2. Administrators in low suspension schools responded more positively on items 75 - 85 than those in high suspension schools (p = .999). These items correspond to factors V A-C.
3. Administrators in high suspension schools tended to respond more positively on those items that referred specifically to the principals' behavior; those in low schools were more positive on items that were directed toward the general school climate. The prediction criterion was met by 45 of 51 items, with a p value of .999.

Responses of administrators in high suspension schools tended to be very similar. Standard deviations exceeded 1.00 on only eight of the 55 items. Conversely, standard deviations exceeding 1.00 were found on 21 of the 55 items for administrators in low suspension schools.

Question 2.04 Do student perceptions of administrative technique vary from behavior reported by principals?

Question 3.02 What are student perceptions of administrative technique related to discipline?

Factor Analysis - Student Survey

The questionnaire administered to students contained 45 items that comprised five scales corresponding to those in the administrator and teacher instrument. Useable questionnaires were completed by 1,124 students in the eight subject schools. A factor analysis (varimax rotation) was done on the 45 items comprising the five scales. The factor analysis yielded eight factors that were designated as subscales of the initial five scales. Results of the factor analysis are in Table 11. Final rotated factor matrices are in Appendix A.

Table 11 Student Subscales Derived from Factor Analysis of 55 items

Leadership		
Factor	I-A	Personal traits of the principal
Factor	I-B	Principal as the school leader
Mediation-Facilitation		
Factor	II	Principal's role as mediator-facilitator
Discipline		
Factor	III-A	Humanism of the principal
Factor	III-B	Rule enforcement
Decision-making		
Factor	IV	Principal's style of decision-making
Climate		
Factor	V-A	Social environment of the school
Factor	V-B	Learning environment of the school

Discriminant Analysis

A discriminant analysis was done with all factors between students in low and high suspension schools. The results of the analysis are in Table 12. A percentage ≤ 60.00 is to be considered a significant accuracy of classification.

Table 12 Discriminant Analysis for Students in Low and High Suspension Schools

	Low	High
Low	*89.42	10.58
High	83.50	16.50
	**(56.32)	(43.68)

*Underlined indicates percent of correct classification

**Prior probabilities

Students in low suspension schools were accurately classified, while those in high suspension schools were inaccurately classified. This finding indicated that based on all factors, students in low and high suspension schools seemed to respond similarly.

Discriminant analyses were then done with various combinations of independent variables. The results of this set of analyses indicated that there were differences in male and female responses within low and high suspension schools. Differences in the responses of black students were apparent between low and high suspension schools.

In an attempt to sharpen the discrimination, a series of t-tests was done comparing individual item responses by various combinations of the high/low, male/female, and black/white variables. There was a concentration of significant differences on those items that loaded on factors V-A and V-B, social and learning environments (climate scales).

Another set of discriminant analyses was then run based on the climate factors only. Results of the discriminant analyses are displayed in Tables 13 through 16.

Table 13 Discriminant Analyses for Low/High Suspension by Sex

Low Suspension - All Factors

	Male	Female
Male	*75.60	24.40
Female	47.25	52.75
	**(54.88)	(45.12)

Low Suspension - Factors V-A & B

	Male	Female
Male	*81.77	18.23
Female	65.10	34.90
	**(56.30)	(43.70)

High Suspension - All Factors

	Male	Female
Male	43.50	56.50
Female	22.31	77.69
	(46.17)	(53.83)

High Suspension - Factors V-A & B

	Male	Female
Male	32.43	67.57
Female	22.67	77.33
	(46.33)	(53.67)

*Underlined indicates percent of correct classification
**Prior probabilities

Analysis with all factors accurately classified males in low suspension schools, while the classification for females was almost random. The accuracy of the classification of males in low suspension schools was increased by focusing on the Factors V-A & B, while the misclassification of females was increased. It appears that based on Factors V-A & B males and females in low suspension schools tended to respond similarly.

This finding was mirrored in high suspension schools, but with a reversal of the sex variable. Based on all factors, females were accurately classified, with an almost random classification for males. Analysis with Factors V-A & B did not affect the accuracy for female classification, but further diminished the accuracy for male classification. Males and females in high suspension schools tended to respond similarly on Factors V-A & B.

Table 14 Discriminant Analysis for Sex and Race by Low/High Suspension

Female by Low/High - All Factors

	Low	High
Low	*65.33	34.67
High	47.51	52.49
	**(51.21)	(48.79)

Female by Low/High - Factors V-A & B

	Low	High
Low	*59.73	40.27
High	39.67	60.33
	(49.83)	(50.17)

Male by Low/High - All Factors

	Low	High
Low	83.73	16.27
High	62.67	37.33
	(59.61)	(40.39)

Male by Low/High - Factors V-A & B

	Low	High
Low	84.38	15.63
High	70.27	29.73
	(59.72)	(40.28)

*Underlined indicates percent of correct classification

**Prior probabilities

Females in low suspension schools were classified accurately based on analysis with all factors, but classified nearly randomly in high suspension schools. Accuracy of the classification for those in high suspension schools was enhanced by utilizing only Factors V-A & B in the analysis, but was diminished for those in low suspension schools. The exclusion of all factors except V-A & B, although reducing the 'low' classification somewhat, still yielded results that were sufficient to indicate significant differences of responses between females in low and high suspension schools.

However, analysis by all factors, or with only V-A & B did not significantly alter the classification of males into low or high suspension categories. In fact, the classification into the low category tended to remain constant, while accuracy of classification into the high category was reduced. Males' responses, then, tended to be similar whether they were actually in a low or high suspension school.

Table 15

Discriminant Analysis for
Race by Low/High Suspension

White by Low/High - All Factors

	Low	High
Low	*83.09	16.91
High	67.14	32.86
	**(80.17)	(19.83)

White by Low/High - Factors V-A & B

	Low	High
Low	*80.69	19.31
High	62.59	37.41
	(57.31)	(42.69)

Black by Low/High - All Factors

	Low	High
Low	44.17	55.83
High	33.08	66.92
	(47.43)	(52.57)

Black by Low/High - Factors VA & B

	Low	High
Low	60.15	39.85
High	33.33	66.67
	(47.00)	(53.00)

*Underlined indicates percent of correct classification

**Prior probabilities

White students were classified very accurately in the low suspension category; this accuracy was not affected by analysis on all factors or by isolating Factors V-A & B. This result indicates that white students in low suspension schools responded very similarly to the student survey. Conversely, classification of whites into the high suspension category was inaccurate. The percentages of inaccurate classifications suggest that many whites in high suspension schools responded as did those in low suspension schools. There appear to be no significant differences in the responses of white students on the basis of their enrollment in a low or high suspension school.

The black students in low suspension schools were classified into the low suspension category almost randomly, based on all factors. However, those in high suspension schools were classified accurately on all factors. Analysis with only Factors V-A & B results in a much sharper discrimination for blacks in low suspension schools, suggesting the importance of climate as a factor in the differentiation of low and high suspension schools. The accuracy of classification of blacks into the high suspension category was unaffected by isolating Factors V-A & B. From the data in Table 15, it is apparent that black students in low and high suspension schools responded quite differently to the items that loaded on Factors V-A & B.

Results of some exploratory t-testing on individual items suggested the possibility of difference of responses by sex on the variable of race. A discriminant analysis was done with the results displayed in Table 16.

Table 16 Discriminant Analysis for Race by Sex on Factors V-A & B

White by Sex

	Male	Female
Male	*68.51	31.49
Female	53.64	46.36
	**(52.71)	(47.29)

Black by Sex

	Male	Female
Male	*59.42	40.58
Female	38.62	61.38
	(48.76)	(51.24)

*Underlined indicates percentage of correct classification
**Prior probabilities

White males were accurately classified, while white females were classified almost randomly. The males apparently responded similarly, with females exhibiting no pattern of response. However, black males and females classification reached a reasonable degree of accuracy, more than would be expected by chance. This finding confirmed results of earlier t-tests which had suggested that black males and females tended to respond differently, irrespective of the low/high variable.

t-tests

All climate items (Factors V-A & B) were tested for significance by the combination of high/low, black/white, and male/female variables. These included items 31 and 60-72.

Significant differences ($p < .05$) were found between white students in low and high suspension schools on eight of the 14 climate items. In every instance, students in low suspension schools responded more favorably than those in high suspension schools on the items in Table 17.

Table 17

Significant Items ($p < .05$)
Using High/Low by White Interaction

Item #	
60	This school is a cheerful place.
61	People are friendly in this school.
64	In this school students have respect for other students.
66	People are honest and sincere in this school.
68	In this school students are not afraid of other students.
69	Students feel welcomed and accepted at this school.
71	I like the students in this school.
31	The principal is in the halls and cafeteria talking to students and teachers.

Tests for significance between black students in low and high suspension schools revealed differences ($p < .05$) on four of the 14 items. Black students in high suspension schools responded more favorably than those in low suspension schools on the items in Table 18.

Table 18 Significant Items ($p < .05$) Using High/Low by Black Interaction

Item #	
60	This school is a cheerful place.
67	I enjoy being at this school.
69	Students feel welcomed and accepted at this school.
72	I like the teachers in this school.

White and black students in low suspension schools were significantly different in their responses to the climate items ($p < .05$). Significance was reached on 10 of the 14 items, with white students responding more favorably than black students on all 10 items. The significant items are in Table 19.

Table 19 Significant Items ($p < .05$) Using White/Black by Low Interaction

Item #	
60	This school is a cheerful place.
61	People are friendly in this school.
62	When a student has a problem, it is easy to find help.
64	In this school students have respect for other students.
67	I enjoy being at this school.
68	In this school students are not afraid of other students.
69	Students feel welcomed and accepted at this school.
71	I like the students in this school.
72	I like the teachers in this school.
31	The principal is in the halls and cafeteria talking to students and teachers.

There were no significant differences on any climate items between white and black students in high suspension schools.

Tests for males' responses between low and high suspension schools indicated significant differences ($p < .05$) on three of the 14 climate items. Males in low suspension schools were more positive than those in high suspension schools. Females in low and high suspension schools differed significantly ($p < .05$) on two of the 14 items, with those in low suspension schools responding more favorably.

Question 2.05 Does administrative perception of discretion to suspend by offense correlate with the ratio of black/white suspensions by offense?

Discretion to Suspend

The questionnaire distributed to administrators contained 30 items related to the degree of discretion exercised by administrators in deciding whether a student should be suspended for a specific offense. A series of t-tests was done on these items, resulting in significant differences ($p < .05$) on two of them. Administrators in low suspension schools indicated a greater degree of discretion in cases involving interference with or intimidation of faculty, staff, personnel, and students. Administrators in high suspension schools reported a greater degree of discretion in cases of smoking in an unauthorized area.

A sign test on the 30 items resulted in administrators of high suspension schools responding that they utilized a lesser degree of discretion than those in low suspension schools on 23 of the 30 items (p .996). This response pattern indicated that administrators in high suspension schools were more prone to suspend students based on formal records and strict adherence to the provisions of the discipline code than their counterparts in low suspension schools.

There was no indication, however, that this behavior has had any impact on the ratios of black/white student suspensions by specific offense. Changes that were made during the 1978-79 school year in the reporting and coding of offenses for which students were suspended, precluded an accurate analysis of ratios of black/white suspensions by offense.

Suspension Rates

Although the sample of schools was selected based on 1977-78 suspension rates, reported rates for the 1978-79 school year justify the selection, with one exception; one school in the low suspension category experienced a rate slightly above the district-wide mean. (Complete suspension data for all schools may be found in Appendix F).

Total suspension rates for sample high suspension schools ranged from approximately 29 percent to 65 percent, while the range for low suspension schools was approximately 11 percent to 31 percent. The rates for black student suspensions ranged for 75 percent to more than 100 percent, in high suspension schools, with low suspension schools reporting rates from 16 percent to 60 percent.

Rates for white student suspensions in high suspension schools ranged from 19 percent to 35 percent, and in low suspension schools for six percent to 24 percent. Ratios of black to white suspensions varied considerably from school to school, with a range of approximately 1:1 to 6:1.

There is no evidence that increases or decreases in the overall suspension rate of a given school have any effect on the ratio of black to white suspensions. The black and white suspension rates varied independently.

Question 3.01 Do the results of student observations of teacher behavior correlate with those of adult observers?

Student Survey

A series of items was included in the student questionnaire that assessed perceptions of the same dimensions of teacher behavior recorded by project observers. This procedure was designed to provide a basis for comparing student/observer perceptions. Student responses constituted a participant observer frame of reference for the comparison of teacher samples in low and high suspension schools.

Student responses were converted to a scale that was comparable to the ID ratios reported by observers, so that direct comparisons could be made. Further, differentiation was made between students' personal and group perceptions of teachers' classroom behavior (see p. 47 for definitions).

Student Perceptions

The normality of the distribution of the variates was checked with the Kolmogorov - Smirnov test. All four sums, (IO, DO, IP, DP) were found to be leptokurtic. In interpreting the results of the data analysis it should be noted that the variable of Sex x High/Low was skewed toward males or lows and the variable of Race x High/Low was skewed toward whites or lows.

Analysis of variance procedures applied to student questionnaire data with IO as the dependent variable yielded the results displayed in Table 20.

Table 20 ANOVA for Student Response on the Indirect-Objective (IO) Variable

Source	df	ms	ss	F
Model	7	33.61	253.33	3.67 (.0007)
Error	1324	9.15	12120.63	
Race	1		86.83	9.49 (.002)
Sex	1		37.64	4.11 (.04)
Race x Sex	1		4.46	0.49 (n.s.)
High/Low	1		63.59	6.95 (.008)
Race x High/Low	1		44.93	4.91 (.02)
Sex x High/Low	1		0.00	0.00 (n.s.)
Race x Sex x High/Low	1		4.84	0.53 (n.s.)
Total	1331		12355.97	

The main effects of race, sex and high/low were all significant beyond the .05 level. Significance was also attained on the race x high/low variable. A series of t-tests was done on the IO measure, using the race, sex, and high/low variables.

Results of the t-testing confirmed the ANOVA. White students in low suspension schools perceive teacher behavior toward classes as groups to be more indirect than those in high suspension schools. A significant difference was apparent in the responses of males and females on the IO variable.

Another ANOVA was done with DO as the dependent variable (Table 21).

Table 21 ANOVA fcr Student Response on the Director-Objective (DO) Variable

Source	df	ms	ss	F
Model	7	9.69	67.86	2.58 (.01)
Error	1324	3.73	4969.23	
Race	1		19.97	5.32 (.02)
Sex	1		23.96	6.38 (.01)
Race x Sex	1		7.19	1.92 (n.s.)
High/Low	1		4.54	1.21 (n.s.)
Race x High/Low	1		9.98	2.66 (n.s.)
Sex x High/Low	1		2.61	0.70 (n.s.)
Race x Sex x High/Low	1		0.00	0.00 (n.s.)
Total	1331		5037.00	

Student responses were t-tested using the same variables as the ANOVA to identify the direction of response. Based on the results of the t-tests, it was apparent that white female students, as a subset of the total student sample, perceived that teachers are less direct in their behavior toward classes as groups. There were some differences in responses on the high/low variable, but these were overshadowed by the race, sex effects. This was consistent with the ANOVA results, in which the race, sex main effects were the only significant variables.

An ANOVA procedure was applied to the Indirect-Personal variable, using the race, sex, and high/low variables as before. The results are in Table 22.

Table 22 ANOVA for Student Responses on the Indirect-Personal (IP) Variable

Source	df	ms	ss	F
Model	7	46.03	322.23	5.28 (.0001)
Error	1324	8.71	11532.75	
Race	1		113.26	13.00 (.0003)
Sex	1		114.86	13.19 (.0003)
Race x Sex	1		7.04	0.81 (n.s.)
High/Low	1		51.59	5.92 (.01)
Race x High/Low	1		33.38	3.83 (.05)
Sex x High/Low	1		0.00	0.00 (n.s.)
Race x Sex x High/Low	1		15.28	1.75 (n.s.)
Total	1331		11854.98	

The main effects of race, sex, and high/low were all significant at the .05 level or beyond, as was the race x high/low interaction. In order to determine the direction of responses, t-tests were done using the race, sex, and high/low variables. Results of the t-tests indicated that white female students in low suspension schools perceived teacher behavior toward individual students to be more indirect than those in high suspension schools. This was consistent with the results of the ANOVA procedure; race, sex, and high/low accounted for significant differences in student responses about teacher behavior.

A final ANOVA was done with the DP measure as the dependent variable (Table 23).

Table 23 ANOVA for Student Responses on the Direct-Personal (DP) Variable

Source	df	ms	ss	F
Model	7	28.15	197.06	6.83 (.0001)
Error	1326	4.12	5466.34	
Race	1		56.96	13.82 (.0002)
Sex	1		91.00	22.08 (.0001)
Race x Sex	1		7.44	1.81 (n.s.)
High/Low	1		13.27	3.22 (n.s.)
Race x High/Low	1		23.90	5.80 (.01)
Sex x High/Low	1		8.79	2.13 (n.s.)
Race x Sex x High/Low	1		0.00	0.00 (n.s.)
Total	1331		5663.40	

Significance was reached on the main effects of race and sex, and on the race by high/low interaction. The p value for the high/low main effect was .07, falling slightly below the established .05 level. The results of t-testing the same combinations of variables for directionality of responses were consistent with the ANOVA results. White female students in low suspension schools perceive that teachers were less direct in their behavior toward individual students than those in high suspension schools.

There were clear differences in student responses on all the classroom interaction measures, IO, DO, IP, and DP. These differences were significant on the race and sex variables on every measure, and on the high/low variable on two of the four measures.

Observer Reports

Analysis of observation data is discussed fully under 1.01 - 1.03 of this section (p. 51). As reported in that section, there were no statistically significant differences in teacher/student interactions between low and high suspension schools; neither were there any differences in the interactions based on the race or sex of the students.

Student responses were converted to ratios so that direct comparisons could be made with the results of the observation data analysis. Correlations were done between the student and observer data. None of the correlation coefficients was significant. The highest reported coefficient was .17, indicating no correlation between student and observer data.

SECTION IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

CONCLUSIONS

Question 1.01 Do teachers in schools with high suspension rates exhibit more directing and restricting behaviors toward students than do teachers in schools with low suspension rates?

Observation Data

Data collected via classroom observation indicated no statistically significant differences in teacher behavior between low and high suspension schools on the direct and indirect measures. However, it is not possible to offer this as a conclusion due to conflicting findings from the analysis of student responses. This conflict is addressed under Section IV p. 94 .

Question 1.02 Are there inconsistencies apparent in the verbal and nonverbal communication patterns of teachers?

Observation Data

There were insufficient tallies of the nonverbal dimension to permit data analysis. Project staff were aware that the observation, interpretation, and recording of nonverbal behaviors was a very difficult assignment. The frequency and complexity of classroom interactions, verbal and nonverbal, probably preclude an accurate assessment and recording of their occurrences.

Student Survey

The responses of students to items covering the nonverbal dimension were more definitive than the reports of observers. Students appeared to be more sensitive to the nonverbal behavior of teachers than did the observers.

Analysis of responses to individual items resulted in significant differences on the race, sex, and high/low variables.

The apparent greater sensitivity of students to facial expressions, gestures, etc., exhibited by teachers is not surprising; students have a personal stake in the classroom dynamics, while the observers were performing an assignment for which they received remuneration. An additional consideration is that students' perceptions are based on a much longer time span than those of the observers, who were only in each classroom a maximum of five consecutive days.

Tests revealed significant differences in nonverbal behaviors on the race and high/low variables. The variable of sex was significant on only one item. White students were more positive than black students on three of four items. This suggests that as a group, white students feel that teachers' nonverbal behaviors are appropriate and supportive.

Students in low suspension schools were more positive toward nonverbal teacher behavior than were those in high suspension schools. This finding is consistent with the responses of students to overall school climate (Section III p. 63). The quality of the atmosphere of each classroom cannot be separated from school climate; student opinions about the school are based on class and nonclass experiences. Just as the climate factor was a recurring discriminator between low and high suspension schools, the nonverbal behavior of teachers appears to vary between low and high suspension schools, from the perspective of the students. According to student responses, teachers in low suspension schools seem to use nonverbal skills more frequently than those in high suspension schools.

Question 1.03 Do teachers tend to react differentially to students on the basis of ethnicity or gender?

Observation Data

Provision was made for the recording of race/sex designations in the observation schedules. Tests for differential reactions to students on the basis of race/sex resulted in no significant differences. Based solely on observation data, there appears to be no significant difference in teachers' responses to students on the basis of race or sex.

Student Data

The results of the analysis of student data are contradictory to the observer data. A series of t-tests revealed significant differences on 12 of 27 items covering classroom interactions.

The issue of differential reaction to students on the basis of race continues unresolved. There was an even division in positive reactions of white and black students on eight items related to teacher behavior toward individual students and the class as a group. There were no indications that teachers consistently reacted differentially to either black or white students. It is likely that in some circumstances students of one race may perceive deference toward those of the other; however, there is no statistical evidence that either race is treated differentially.

There was, however, considerable evidence that students perceive differently the reactions of teachers to males and females. Females were significantly more positive than males on nine of 27 items that were t-tested. The analysis revealed that females felt more positive than males toward teacher responses directed to them personally, as well as toward the class as a group. Throughout the study, females have consistently responded more positively to all aspects of the school and classroom than have males. The possible rationale for this response has been discussed elsewhere in the report.

Apparent differences in student responses on the high/low variable were revealed by the t-testing. Students in low suspension schools were more positive on four of five items on which significance ($p < .05$) was reached. There is some indication that teachers in low suspension schools reacted differently to students than teachers in high suspension schools. Based on student responses, teachers in low suspension schools exhibited more positive behavior toward students than those in high suspension schools.

Question 2.01 Does the interpretation and administration of the rules system impact teachers' responses to disciplinary problems within the classroom?

Discretion to suspend

It is clear that the interpretation and administration of the rules system varies between low and high suspension schools. Administrators in high suspension schools tend to handle disciplinary matters with strict adherence to the provisions of the Jefferson County Discipline Code.

There was a significant difference in the pattern of responses of administrators on a 30 item section of the survey designed to assess the degree of discretion exercised in determining whether a student should be suspended (Sec. III p. 71). Administrators in high suspension schools were more likely to exact the precise punishment for a specific offense, suggesting a greater reliance on the provisions of the discipline code as a means of resolving student discipline problems. On the other hand, a position could be taken that rigid application of the code is justified by the need to maintain an orderly school environment.

There is no direct evidence from the teacher survey that would indicate that interpretation of the rules system influences teacher response to classroom discipline problems. No significant differences were found by t-testing the individual items that loaded on the discipline factors (III A & B). However, previous research clearly documents the impact of administrative behavior and expectations on teacher/student interactions (Section I, p 13). When administrators expect strict adherence to a rules system, that expectation is communicated to teachers, either directly or indirectly. It would follow that teacher expectations for students' classroom behavior would be as tightly defined as those of the administrators.

Administrators in low suspension schools apparently exercise more discretion in deciding discipline cases than those in high suspension schools. They indicated less reliance on the formal discipline code and more reliance on personal judgment. An automatic suspension of a student for a given offense seemed to be less likely to occur in low suspension schools. This approach to discipline is reflected in the suspension rates of the schools in this sample.

Visibility

According to teachers, administrators in low suspension schools were significantly more visible in the school than those in high suspension schools. The principal was more often seen in the hallways, cafeteria, and other areas of the school, interacting with staff and students. The presence of the principal in areas of the school outside his/her office has been found to have a positive influence on the morale of the staff and the behavior of students (Section I p. 13). Given the reported suspension rates and reaction of teachers to school climate items, this observation would seem to be verified by the findings of this study.

Support for teachers

All administrators in the sample indicated that they almost always support teachers in discipline cases. There was no difference in the responses of administrators in low and high suspension schools on this point. A discrepancy was apparent between administrators and teachers in high suspension schools;

although administrators indicated almost unswerving support for teachers, the teachers in high suspension schools were significantly less positive on that item than teachers in low suspension schools. Administrators and teachers in low suspension schools were in agreement on the support given teachers in discipline situations.

Respect for students

An interesting finding was the significant difference of responses between administrators in low and high suspension schools regarding teacher respect for students. Those in low suspension schools were significantly more positive in responding. Teacher respect for students, although loading on a climate factor, may have an influence on the classroom behavior of students. It may also reflect the tone of the total school environment.

Summary

The apparent rigidity of the interpretation of the rules system by administrators in high suspension schools could be reflective of a rigidly structured school environment. This notion was supported by the significant differences in responses of teachers in low and high suspension schools toward school climate. Results of data analysis indicate that teachers in low suspension schools were more positive on all school climate items than their counterparts in high suspension schools.

Teacher expectations of classroom behavior would likely be consistent with those of the administrators. In the case of low suspension schools, it appears that administrative notions about discipline were more relaxed and informal than those in high suspension schools. This was supported by the discretion utilized in discipline cases, the visibility of the principal, and the perception of teacher respect for students. Responses to these characteristics were significantly different between low and high suspension schools.

Question 2.02 Does administrative technique to accomplish communication, management, and decision-making vary for high schools with high and low suspension rates?

Administrative technique

The results of the discriminant analysis with all factors indicated significant differences between administrators in low and high suspension schools, although differences by specific administrative functions were not readily discernible. Administrators in high suspension schools tended to respond very similarly, with small standard deviations on all items. Conversely, those in low suspension schools displayed a wider range of responses on all items. It should be pointed out that some administrators were opposed to participation in the project, and that their responses may not represent an objective assessment of administrative behavior.

Administrators in high suspension schools responded more positively to items that made direct reference to the principal. Most of these were items that loaded on Factors I-A through IV, representing the selected dimensions of administrative technique. Responses of teachers in high suspension schools tended to confirm this finding, in that items on which they were significantly more positive than teachers in low suspension schools made reference to administrative technique. Administrators and teachers in high suspension schools were more positive toward administrative technique than in low suspension schools.

Climate

A major difference in responses of administrators in low and high suspension schools centered around factors and items concerned with school climate. Administrators in low suspension schools were more positive toward climate items than those in high suspension schools, particularly on teacher respect for students. Teachers in low suspension schools confirmed this finding, being significantly more positive on climate items than their counterparts in high suspension schools.

Administrators in low suspension schools appeared to be more concerned about the human relations aspect of their schools, and less about being perceived as dynamic administrators. They responded favorably on those items that referred to mutual respect between faculty and students, friendliness and cheerfulness of the school, and the lack of fear among students.

All evidence indicates that administrators in low and high suspension schools differ significantly in their approaches to communication, management, decision-making, and leadership style. Those in high suspension schools perceived themselves, and are perceived by their teachers as capably performing the administrative functions assigned to them. However, it would seem that they have not attended to the development and maintenance of a positive school climate. It is possible that administrators in high suspension schools were unaware of the nature of the climate, or did not perceive that it is an important factor. The end result is the same; from the perspective of administrators and teachers, school climate is more positive in low suspension schools than in high suspension schools.

Question 2.03 Do teacher perceptions of administrative technique vary from behavior reported by principals?

Administrative Technique

Teachers in low and high suspension schools were accurately classified by the discriminant analysis on all factors. A subsequent analysis of variance by item revealed 11 items on which teachers responded significantly differently based on the high/low variable. Of the 11 items that were significant, five loaded on factors that related to administrative technique. Teachers in high suspension schools were more positive on three of these items. They indicated that principals in high suspension schools were considered as the driving force in their schools, that they attempted to deal with potential problems before a major problem develops, and were sympathetic to the needs of teachers. This pattern of significantly more positive responses to administrative technique was consistent with that displayed by administrators in high suspension schools; i.e., they too were more positive on items related to administrative technique.

The teachers in low suspension schools were more positive on two of the items relating to administrative technique. Their responses indicated that principals in low suspension schools were more frequently visible in the halls and cafeteria interacting with students and staff, and were more likely to support the teacher in discipline situations. It is interesting to note that the visibility of the principal was a significant item in the analysis of student responses, with white students in low suspension schools indicating greater visibility for principals than whites or blacks in high suspension schools. Teachers and white students in low suspension schools agreed on the greater frequency of the principals' presence in areas of the school other than his/her office.

The greater likelihood of administrators in low suspension schools supporting teachers in discipline situations was, on the face of it, a finding that seems inconsistent with other patterns of administrative behavior. It appears from analysis of administrator responses that suspension for some offenses was virtually automatic in high suspension schools, with little or no discretion exercised by the administrator. One might anticipate that the administrators in those schools would be more likely to support the teacher in discipline situations; however, according to teacher responses, this is not the case. Project staff suggest that administrators in low suspension schools have developed a balanced approach to dealing with discipline problems; discretion is exercised in disposition of these problems, while at the same time communicating support for the teacher.

The issue of support for the teacher in discipline situations was the only point of disagreement between teachers and administrators in high suspension schools. Although administrators indicated a high degree of support, this position was not confirmed by teacher responses.

Based on all available data, teacher perceptions of administrative technique, and behavior reported by principals within the subsets of low and high suspension schools, appeared to be consistent.

School Climate

The most salient features of the analysis of data from the administrator and teacher surveys were; (1) the apparent differences in attitudes of administrators in low and high suspension schools toward climate, and (2) the attitudes of teachers in those subsets of schools toward climate. Administrators in low suspension schools tended to be more positive on all climate items than their counterparts in high suspension schools. Teachers in low suspension schools were significantly more positive on all climate items on the high/low and sex by high/low variables. The importance of the element of climate was further reinforced by the responses of white students in low suspension schools.

There was an apparent consistency then, in the responses of administrators, teachers, and white students in low suspension schools toward the quality of the school climate. All three groups were significantly more positive than their counterparts in high suspension schools.

School climate emerged as a critical element in the differentiation of low and high suspension schools, given the constraints of this study. It surfaced early in the stages of data analysis and repeatedly accounted for much of the significant difference found between the two subsets of schools, low and high suspension.

Question 2.04 Do student perceptions of administrative technique vary from behavior reported by principals?

Administrative technique

The discriminant analysis on all factors revealed no significant difference in the responses of students in low and high suspension schools. Subsequent t-testing on individual items resulted in significance on one item related to administrative technique. White students in low suspension schools indicated a high level of visibility for the principal; i.e., the principal was often seen in the halls and cafeteria interacting with students and staff. This was consistent with the responses of teachers in low suspension schools, who also indicated a high level of visibility for the principal.

Lack of significant differences in the responses of students toward administrative technique was an unexpected finding. The problem was not item clarity, as the students with which the instrument was field-tested had no difficulty understanding the items. Maturity level of the students could have had an effect on the results; it is possible that ninth-grade students may have approached the completion of the instrument with less seriousness than desired.

The administrative techniques in low and high suspension schools were apparently different according to the responses of administrators and teachers. Students' perceptions, however, were inconsistent with both of these groups. Some differences were anticipated, particularly on those items loading on the Discipline factors (III-A Fairness and III-B Rules Enforcement), but none materialized.

Student perceptions of administrative technique seemed to vary from behavior reported by principals. Although principals reported differing administrative techniques between low and high suspension schools, students in those schools apparently responded very similarly to the survey.

School Climate

As was the case for the teacher sample, significant differences were found in the responses of the student sample on the low/high variable. White students in low suspension schools were significantly more favorable toward school climate than were black students in those schools. There were also significant differences in the responses of white students in low and high suspension schools, with those in low schools being more favorable toward climate. White students in low suspension schools were clearly the most positive in their responses to school climate.

The apparent differences in perceptions of climate between white and black students in low suspension schools was in sharp contrast to high suspension schools; there was no significant difference between whites and blacks on any climate item. This indicated that white and black students in high suspension schools perceived the climate very similarly.

Favorable responses of white students in low suspension schools were expected outcomes; however, further analysis by race indicated that black students in high suspension schools were more positive toward school climate than those in low suspension schools, which was unexpected. Significance was reached on exactly half as many climate items for black students as for whites.

A possible explanation for the responses of black students is the differing racial composition of sample classes in low and high suspension schools. Composition of classes in low suspension schools tended to reflect more closely the racial balance of the school, ranging from 20 to 40 percent black. Classes in high suspension schools tended to be predominantly white or black, with relatively few in the 20 to 40 percent range. Black students may feel more comfortable in classes in which they constitute a majority, and thus, have a more favorable attitude toward climate than their counterparts in low suspension schools.

The responses of students analyzed by the low/high, black/white, and male/female variables yielded some significant differences. Females in low and high suspension schools responded very differently, according to the discriminant analysis on only the climate factors. Those in low suspension schools were more favorable toward climate. White females in low suspension schools were more positive toward climate than any other group.

Males, white and black, tended to respond similarly, irrespective of the low/high variable. There were apparent response patterns by the race and sex variable. White females were more positive toward climate than any other group. White and black males' responses were similar, but less positive than the white females' responses. The most negative responses came from black females, whether in low or high suspension schools. The discriminant analysis for race by sex showed a significant difference in the responses of black males and females, but not for white males and females.

The relatively extreme negative responses of black females may be the result of lack of opportunities for recognition in the school community. Access to clubs, athletics and other extracurricular activities is limited for black females. This is borne out by an inspection of high school yearbooks, in which the underrepresentation of black females in school activities is apparent. The black female may not feel that she is a valued member of the school community, and, as a result, respond very negatively toward the school environment.

On the other hand, white and black males are afforded an opportunity to participate more fully in school activities, particularly athletics. They are more likely to form personal relationships through these activities, and to experience a sense of "belonging".

Historically, white females have few difficulties in negotiating the public school experience. There are those who would characterize the public school system as an institution that is oriented toward and dominated by white, middle-class females. Irrespective of the accuracy of that assessment, white females were significantly more positive than any other group of students toward school climate.

Question 2.05 Does administrative perception of discretion to suspend by offense correlate with the ratio of black/white suspensions by offense?

Discretion to Suspend

The responses of administrators in low and high suspension schools fell into distinct directionality on the issue of the degree of discretion utilized in suspension decisions. It was apparent that administrators in low suspension schools tended to exercise greater discretion in suspending students than did those in high suspension schools.

An underlying assumption of this question was the notion that the exercise of greater discretion in discipline cases would lead to a greater disproportionate rate of black suspensions by specific offense. However, the findings of this study were contrary to that assumption; i.e., greater discretion in suspension decisions seemed to result in a lower overall suspension rate, and did not significantly affect the ratio of black to white rates by offense.

The mean proportion of black to white suspensions across all schools was 3.2:1, but varies considerably from school to school and from offense to offense. There is no evidence to indicate that the rates were disproportionate as a result of the degree of discretion exercised by administrators.

Reference to the suspension rates of schools as low or high may be some what misleading; even in "low" suspension schools as much as 38.4 percent of the black enrollment was suspended during the school year. Examining the suspension rates for all secondary schools, it is apparent that the lowest rates for black students were often equal to or greater than the highest rates for white students (Appendix F).

The finding that administrators in high suspension schools tended to adhere more closely to provisions of the discipline code suggests that this rigidity may contribute to high suspension rates. It logically follows that exercising less choice in determining the punishment for a given offense would result in the suspension of more students.

Suspension Rates

There is no evidence from the reported suspension data that the degree of discretion exercised by administrators had any impact on the ratio of black to white suspensions. Variations in black/white ratios exhibited by individual schools within the total sample and within the subsets of low and high suspension schools demonstrated that there were no patterns of deference to black or white students.

Project staff have observed some decline in county-wide suspension rates between the 1977-78 and 1978-79 school years, which suggests that efforts by school administrators and staff toward reducing suspension rates have met with some success. The problems of school discipline and suspensions persist, but there are continuing concerns and actions to solve them.

Question 3.01 Do the results of student observations of teacher behavior correlate with those of adult observers?

Observer and Student Data

There were no significant correlations between observer and student data. The highest correlation coefficient obtained was .17. The apparent disparity between adult observers' and students' perceptions may be the result of several conditions. It is possible that the observation instrument utilized was ineffective in discriminating between various classroom interactions. Project observers may have misinterpreted or failed to record critical interactions. Whatever the cause, observers' reports did not reflect the classroom behavior reported by students. Analysis of observation data is reported in Section III p. 51 . The analysis of student responses on the same dimension of teacher behavior follows.

Student Responses

The objective measures (Indirect Objective - Direct Objective) purported to assess student perceptions of how teachers reacted to classes as groups. The variables of race and high/low were significant in the analysis of the Indirect Objective measure. White students in low suspension schools indicated that teacher behavior toward classes as groups was more indirect than those in high suspension schools. There were no apparent differences in the responses of males and females.

Analysis of student responses on the Direct Objective variable indicated that white female students perceived that teachers were less direct in their behavior toward classes as groups. The responses of white females were independent of the high/low variable; i.e., their perception of teachers as less directing was unaffected by their enrollment in low or high suspension schools.

There were no apparent differences in the responses of males and females.

Analysis of student responses on the Direct Objective variable indicated that white female students perceived that teachers were less direct in their behavior toward classes as groups. The responses of white females were independent of the high/low variable; i.e., their perception of teachers as less directing was unaffected by their enrollment in low or high suspension schools. This was consistent with the findings throughout the study; white females appeared to be more positive toward school than any other eth-sex group.

Students' perceptions of teachers' reactions to them as individuals were assessed by the personal measures (Indirect Personal - Direct Personal). On the Indirect Personal measure, white female students in low suspension schools perceived teacher behavior toward individual students to be more indirect than those in high suspension schools. It is interesting to note that the high/low main effect was significant on both analyses of indirect behavior, but not on the analysis of direct behavior. The positive responses of the white female students were based on the reactions of teachers to them as individuals as were the more negative responses of white and black males and black females.

The final analysis was on the Direct Personal measure. Again, white female students in low suspension schools perceive that teachers are less direct in their behavior toward individual students than those in high suspension schools.

As was the case with the analysis of the climate factor, white female students seem to be consistently more positive toward the quality of classroom interaction than any other group. However, white students as a subset of the total student sample responded more favorably than black students on the indirect objective measure. This would indicate that white students were more positive toward teacher interactions with them as a group than are black students.

Question 3.02 What are student perceptions of administrative techniqué related to discipline?

None of the statistical procedures applied to factors III A & B, or the individual items that loaded on them, produced any significant differences. Apparently students in low and high suspension schools perceive administrators' handling of discipline quite similarly.

The consistency of rules enforcement didn't seem to vary between low and high suspension schools, according to student responses. This would appear to nullify the argument that misbehavior is often overlooked in low suspension schools, resulting in lower suspension rates. Students' responses indicate that the enforcement of rules was equally consistent in low and high suspension schools.

The issue of fairness was the focus of some items in the questionnaire. There were no significant differences in the responses of students in low and high suspension schools on any of these items. Students seemed to perceive administrative handling of discipline similarly, whether they were in low or high suspension schools.

SUMMARY

Differences in variables under study seldom seem to be quite as distinctive as might be hoped for; however, the frequency of statistical significance in the current study was gratifying. Project staff feel that a reasonable amount of confidence can be placed in the findings, although there is a high level of probability that some will be disputed. The following is offered as an attempt to distill the results of the many tests to which data were subjected.

1. Trained observers perceived no differences in classroom interactions between low and high suspension schools.

2. Students in low suspension schools perceived more frequent use of nonverbal skills by teachers than their counterparts in high suspension schools.

3. There was apparently no differential reaction to students on the basis of race in low or high suspension schools.

4. White students in low suspension schools perceived that teachers were more indirect than those in high suspension schools.

5. White female students in low suspension schools indicated more indirect teacher behavior toward them as individuals.

6. There were no differences in the consistency of rules enforcement between low and high suspension schools based on student perceptions.

7. Administrators and teachers in low suspension schools seemed to be in agreement on the administrative techniques manifested by principals.

8. Administrators in low suspension schools exhibited greater visibility than those in high suspension schools.

9. A greater degree of discretion was utilized in the disposition of discipline problems by administrators in low suspension schools.

10. According to administrators, teachers in low suspension schools tended to respect the students.

11. Administrators in low suspension schools seemed to be more sensitive to the importance of climate than those in high suspension schools.

12. Administrators, teachers, and white students in low suspension schools were more positive toward school climate than their counterparts in high suspension schools.

13. The sample of required ninth grade classes in low suspension schools approximated the racial balance of the schools.

14. Ratios of black to white suspensions varied independently of the total suspension rates of individual schools.

15. Students in low and high suspension schools perceived no differences in the administrative disposition of discipline problems.

16. Administrators and teachers in high suspension schools appeared to be in agreement on the administrative techniques utilized by principals.

17. The sample of required ninth grade classes in high suspension schools did not reflect the racial balance of the schools.

18. There was some indication of differential reaction to students on the basis of sex in low and high suspension schools, according to student perceptions.

19. The quality of school climate was the most discriminating factor in differentiating low and high suspension schools.

20. Teachers and students seemed to be more sensitive than administrators to school climate.

Project activities during Phase II will focus on the design of staff development strategies and materials to remediate problems identified by the current study. The process will include active involvement of appropriate administrators and teachers in collaborative efforts to design an effective staff development program, so that no recommendations are offered beyond the scope of work for Phase II.

Further research is indicated on the various dimensions of school climate; there is a need to isolate climate components more discretely than was done in this study. The apparent discrepancies between student and observer perceptions of classroom interactions were enigmatic to project staff. Which set of data most accurately represented classroom reality; that from the students or the observers? It is anticipated that an increasing level of cooperation from local school staff will permit additional opportunities to study school climate and classroom interactions.

98

References

Ackerly, R.L. and Gluckman, I.B. The Reasonable Exercise of Authority, II. Reston, Va.: NASSP, 1976.

Barr, Goodnight, Sall, Helwig. Statistical Analysis System (SAS), SAS Institute, Raleigh, N.C., 1979.

Becker, H.S. Social-Class Variations in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1952, 25, 451-464.

Boyd, J.D. and Bowers, R.A. Behavior Analysis: The Principal and Discipline. Clearing House, 1974, 48, 420-426.

Brophy, J.E. and Good, T.L. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

Brumbaugh, R.B. Hierarchical Role Immediacy and Superordinate Control Orientation: Notes Toward a Theory. Journal of Educational Administration, 1969, 7 (2), 160-168.

Bullock, W., Jr. The Relationship of Educational Training and Years of Administrative Experience to Role Perceptions of High School Principals. Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 63, 3-5.

Buxton, T.H., Prichard, K.W., Bingham, C.M., Jackson, C.E., and Talps, L. Black and White Teachers and Desegregation. Integrated Education, 1974, 12 (1-2), pp. 19-22.

Carter, D.G. The School Principal and the Use of Detention, Suspension and Expulsion as Disciplinary Measures. Pennsylvania State University, 1976, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 122382).

Clark, K.B. Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Doll, R.C. Leadership to Improve Schools. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1972.

Faulk, H.R. Desegregation in McKeesport. Integrated Education, 1972, 10, 35-38.

Fuchs, E. Teachers Talk: Views from Inside City Schools. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Gallup, G.H. Ninth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 59, 33-48.

Giles, H.H. The Integrated Classroom. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Goulder, Helen P. The Natural History of the Education of the Black Child in the City. Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, Social Science Institute, June, 1971.

Green, R.L. and Brydon, J. Investing in Youth: An Approach to Discipline in Urban Schools. In Discipline and Learning. Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., 1975.

Griffiths, W.E. Student Constitutional Rights: The Role of the Principal. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1968, 52 (329), 30-37.

Grossman, L., Clark, D., Lawenherz, L., and Pugh, C. Color the Problem Black--But Not Entirely, Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 489-493.

Gubser, M.M. Authoritarianism Among Teachers and School Principals and its Possible Relationship to Faculty Morale. Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 63, 36-38.

Heichberger, R.L. Toward a Strategy for Humanizing the Change Process in Schools. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1973, 7 (1), 78-85.

Jacobson, L. and Rosenthal, R. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Johnson, James A., Jr. Ed. "On the Interface Between Low-Income, Urban Black Children and Their Teachers During the Early School Years: A Position Paper," Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, November, 1973.

Justin, N. Racial Balancing of Students and Faculty. Intellect, 101 (2344), 91-92.

Kallem, J.H. How Principal Characteristics Affect Pupil Civil Rights. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1975, 59 (393), 57-9.

Kostman, S. The Principal as Mediator and Leader. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1972, 56 (363), 11-18.

Kron, K.H. and Faber, C.F. How Does the Teacher Cope with the Culture Shock? Clearing House, 1973, 47, 506-507.

Ley, R. Labor Turnover as a Function of Worker Differences, Work Environment, and Authoritarianism of Foreman. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 497-500.

Marcus, B.J. Discipline and the School Calendar. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1977, 61 (406), 88-90.

Mutimer, D.D. and Rosemier, R.A. Behavior Problems of Children as Viewed by Teachers and the Children Themselves. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 583-587.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkin, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., Bent, D.H. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago., 1975.

Niemeyer, J.H. Importance of the Inner-City Teacher. In R.D. Strom (ed.), The Inner-City Classroom: Teacher Behaviors. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.

Noar, G. *The Teacher and Integration*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1974.

Orfield, G. How to Make Desegregation Work: The Adaptation of Schools to Their Newly-Integrated Student Bodies. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 1975, 39, 314-340.

Parody, O.F. *The High School Principal and Staff Deal With Discipline*. Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Pederson, M. Effective and Ineffective Actions of the High School Principal. *Journal of Secondary Education*, 1970, 45, 260-264.

Peretti, P.O. and Swenson, K. Bussing. Teachers' Attitudes and Interracial Discipline Problems. Illinois School Journal, 1975, 55(1), 49-55.

Philadelphia Public School District, Pa. *Discipline in the Philadelphia Public Schools: A Working Document*. Philadelphia, Pa.: School District of Philadelphia Board of Education, 1976.

Rajpal, P.L. What Behavior Problems Do Teachers Regard as Serious? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1972, 53, pp. 591-2.

Rideout, B.W. *A Study of the Relationship of High Schools and Student Perceptions of School Climate, Student Alienation, Teacher-Student Relationships, Student Deviant Behavior and Voluntary Participation in Extra-Class Activities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1974.

Rosenfeld, Gerry. *"Shut Those Thick Lips!": A Study of Slum School Failure*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Saxe, R.W. (ed). *Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

Shinn, R. Cultural Conflict in the Classroom: Emphasis on Teachers as Classroom Communicators. *Contemporary Education*, 1971, 43,21-25.

Stebbins, Robert A. "The Meaning of Disorderly Behavior: Teacher Definitions of a Classroom Situation," *Sociology of Education*, 44, p. 217-236 (Spring) 1970.

Tjosvold, D. and Kastelic, T. Effects of Student Motivation and the Principal's Values on Teacher Directiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1976, 68, 768-773.

Turnage, M. The Principal: Change Agent in Desegregation. *Integrated Education*, 1972, 10, 41-45.

Tye, K.A.; Golub, J.S.; and Wall, C.C. The People and the Processes in the School: Key to a Humanistic Curriculum. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 1976, 5 (3), 6-7.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. *What Students Perceive*. (Clearing House Publication No. 24). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, undated.

Uredevor, L.E. The Effects of Desegregation Upon School Discipline. *Journal of Secondary Education*, 1967, 42.

Vacca, R.S. The Principal as a Disciplinarian: Some Thoughts and Suggestions for the 70's. *High School Journal*, 1971, 54, 405-409.

Valenti, R.D. Some Principles for Secondary School Principals. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 1977, 61 (406), 91-93.

Valentine, J.W.; Tate, B.L.; Seagren, A.T.; and Lammel, J.A. Administrative Verbal Behavior: What You Say Does Make a Difference. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 1975, 59 (395), 67-74.

Wiggins, T.W. A Comparative Investigation of Principal Behavior and School Climate. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1972, 66, 103-105.

Wint, J. Contrasting Solutions for School Violence. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1975, 57, 175-176.

Wolcott, H.F. *The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Zanella, R.E. Looking at Corporal Punishment: Can Principals Still Discipline? *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 1976, 60 (397), 67-70.

APPENDIX A

FACTOR ANALYSIS

FACTOR ANALYSIS

I. Factor list

A. Administrator Factors

I-A	Visibility of the principal
I-B	Authority figures within the school
I-C	Human relations skills
I-D	Co-curricular emphasis of the school
I-E	Authority exercised by principal
II-A	Principal decision making criterion
II-B	Principal's management of the environment
III-A	Principal-student relations
III-B	Rule enforcement
III-C	Principal's fairness in discipline
IV-A	Principal's style of decision making
V-A	Staff-student mutual respect
V-B	Evaluation of attitude toward environment
V-C	Student as the focus of the school

B. Teacher Factors

I-A	Style of leadership
I-B	Role of principal in planning school structure
I-C	Style of management
II-A	Principal's role as mediator-facilitator
III-A	Student as the focus of the school
III-B	Rule enforcement
IV-A	Principal's style of decision making
V-A	Climate

C. Student Factors

I-A	Personal traits of the principal
I-B	Principal as the school leader
II-A	Principal's role as mediator-facilitator
III-A	Humanism of the principal
III-B	Rule enforcement
IV-A	Principal's style of decision making
V-A	Social environment of the school
V-B	Learning environment of the school

II. Computation Results (R-matrix - rotated factor pattern of items with 5 pre-established scales*)

A. Administrator Results

1. 20 Leadership Items

Item	I-A	I-B	I-C	I-D	I-E	h^2
31	573	-450	-200	350	324	799
32	-298	866	126	-265	-021	927
33	071	-225	081	-054	860	806
34	099	811	-198	103	-252	781
35	101	-203	086	-016	797	695
36	-034	817	-158	050	-259	764
37	504	-276	472	026	466	771
38	795	215	032	-170	150	731
39	190	-014	163	381	678	668
40	302	-115	756	073	136	701
41	188	-354	276	-007	727	766
42	489	-239	415	-000	567	791
43	640	059	232	341	100	595
44	729	-041	145	284	077	641
45	514	105	434	215	450	714
46	664	089	476	115	345	809
47	384	042	245	248	578	606
48	065	-259	415	565	059	567
49	199	062	099	854	047	786
50	052	-060	781	230	272	744

*Listed values were truncated from computer printout values.

2. 10 Facilitation Mediation Items

Item	II-A	II-B	h^2
51	847	141	738
52	463	276	291
53	785	277	693
54	511	596	616
55	789	459	834
56	808	327	760
57	843	129	729
58	580	530	618
59	240	824	738
60	133	880	792

3. 9 Discipline Items

Item	III-A	III-B	III-C	h^2
61	299	519	406	525
62	633	267	457	681
63	-144	436	768	801
64	387	014	615	528
65	083	-068	684	480
66	110	898	-011	818
67	040	894	051	805
68	703	013	295	581
69	772	099	-154	631

4. 5 Decision Making Items

Item	IV	h^2
70	783	613
71	823	677
72	848	719
73	859	739
74	746	556

5. 11 Climate Items

Item	V-A	V-B	V-C	h^2
75	092	774	321	711
76	062	814	276	744
77	-001	078	891	801
78	381	182	476	406
79	790	228	144	698
80	905	127	101	847
81	591	245	556	720
82	399	430	536	632
83	342	695	-002	601
84	482	668	-004	679
85	496	406	370	549

B. Teacher Results

1. 20 Leadership Items

Item	I-A	I-B	I-C	h^2
1	268	831	024	763
2	-168	-705	-044	527
3	291	639	307	589
4	079	-765	-329	700
5	272	280	757	725
6	-048	-370	-706	639
7	797	155	138	678
8	682	180	037	500
9	771	-013	329	703
10	769	028	380	737
11	658	315	306	627
12	439	462	283	487
13	753	353	089	701
14	751	192	-074	606
15	807	294	034	740
16	884	138	065	806
17	812	194	101	708
18	618	314	-421	658
19	698	104	-005	499
20	789	036	413	795

2. 10 Mediation Facilitation Items

Item	II	h^2
21	830	689
22	663	440
23	832	692
24	811	658
25	901	813
26	888	790
27	879	774
28	813	661
29	826	683
30	796	634

3. 9 Discipline Items

Item	III-A	III-B	h^2
31	167	892	825
32	741	115	562
33	549	484	536
34	554	284	388
35	840	058	710
36	264	857	805
37	075	901	818
38	702	374	633
39	671	061	454

4. 5 Decision Maker Items

Item	IV	h^2
40	783	614
41	835	697
42	893	798
43	829	687
44	876	768

5. 11 Climate Items

Item	V	h^2
45	747	559
46	697	486
47	782	612
48	747	558
49	809	655
50	818	669
51	817	667
52	841	707
53	640	410
54	888	790
55	789	623

C. Student Results

1. 14 Leadership Items

Item	I-A	I-B	h^2
28	567	377	464
29	160	748	585
30	684	264	537
32	776	227	654
33	760	175	609
34	690	368	613
35	642	384	559
36	213	613	422
37	173	638	437
38	833	138	713
39	725	232	580
40	774	136	617
41	693	250	543
42	236	685	525

2. 6 Mediation Facilitation Items

Item	II	h^2
43	782	612
44	724	524
45	794	631
46	677	459
47	854	729
48	808	652

3. 8 Discipline Items

Item	III-A	III-B	h^2
49	184	812	694
50	684	253	532
51	670	028	450
52	662	282	517
53	526	117	290
54	121	836	714
55	712	059	510
56	719	160	543

4. 3 Decision Making Items

Item	IV	h^2
57	829	687
58	858	737
59	849	722

5. 14 Climate Items

Item	V-A	V-B	h^2
60	475	589	563
61	703	302	586
62	451	542	498
63	334	592	462
64	774	087	607
65	537	384	435
66	633	319	503
67	470	602	583
68	549	027	303
69	610	518	640
70	306	703	587
71	612	354	501
72	268	711	577
31	143	676	477

APPENDIX B

SELECTED ANOVA TABLES

ANOVAs Selected for Significance of High/Low Main Effect and/or High/Low x Sex Interaction*

A. High/Low Main Effect

Dependent Variable: Item 8

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	21.59	3.08
Error	62	83.38	1.34
Corrected Total	69	104.98	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	10.11	7.52	0.008
Race	1	0.92	0.69	0.410
Hilow*Race	1	0.00	0.00	1.000
Sex	1	4.40	3.27	0.075
Hilow*Sex	1	4.27	3.18	0.079
Race*Sex	1	0.55	0.41	0.524
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	1.53	1.14	0.288

Dependent Variable: Item 12

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	21.98	3.14
Error	60	77.23	1.28
Corrected Total	67	99.22	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	9.85	7.65	0.007
Race	1	1.57	1.22	0.273
Hilow*Race	1	2.00	1.55	0.217
Sex	1	0.00	0.00	0.974
Hilow*Sex	1	4.86	3.78	0.056
Race*Sex	1	4.49	3.49	0.066
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	0.00	0.00	1.000

*Values listed were truncated from computer printout values.

```
Dependent Variable: Item 23

   Source            DF        Sum of Squares          Mean Square

   Model              7            14.21                   2.03

   Error             62            73.78                   1.19

   Corrected Total   69            88.00

   Source            DF          Anova SS        F Value        PR F

   Hilow              1            4.66            3.92         0.052
   Race               1            0.90            0.76         0.386
   Hilow*Race         1            3.36            2.83         0.097
   Sex                1            2.07            1.74         0.191
   Hilow*Sex          1            0.69            0.58         0.448
   Race*Sex           1            3.15            2.65         0.108
   Hilow*Race*Sex     1            0.00            0.00         1.000

Dependent Variable: Item 25

   Source            DF        Sum of Squares          Mean Square

   Model              7            19.82                   2.83

   Error             62            73.04                   1.17

   Corrected Total   69            92.87

   Source            DF          Anova SS        F Value        PR F

   Hilow              1            4.42            3.76         0.057
   Race               1            2.42            2.06         0.156
   Hilow*Race         1            2.52            2.14         0.148
   Sex                1            2.63            2.24         0.139
   Hilow*Sex          1            4.53            3.85         0.054
   Race*Sex           1            3.79            3.22         0.077
   Hilow*Race*Sex     1            0.00            0.00         1.000

Dependent Variable: Item 34

   Source            DF        Sum of Squares          Mean Square

   Model              7             5.76                   0.82

   Error             61            38.86                   0.63

   Corrected Total   68            44.63

   Source            DF          Anova SS        F Value        PR F

   Hilow              1            2.53            3.98         0.050
   Race               1            0.07            0.12         0.730
   Hilow*Race         1            0.91            1.44         0.235
   Sex                1            1.22            1.93         0.170
   Hilow*Sex          1            0.40            0.64         0.426
   Race *Sex          1            0.41            0.65         0.424
   Hilow*Race*Sex     1            0.19            0.30         0.585
```

Dependent Variable: Item 53

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	8.75	1.25
Error	59	64.40	1.09
Corrected Total	66	73.16	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	4.09	3.75	0.057
Race	1	0.78	0.72	0.400
Hilow*Race	1	0.44	0.41	0.525
Sex	1	0.05	0.05	0.825
Hilow*Sex	1	0.04	0.04	0.842
Race*Sex	1	1.69	1.55	0.218
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	1.64	1.51	0.224

Dependent Variable: Item 54

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	12.58	1.79
Error	59	40.57	0.68
Corrected Total	66	53.16	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	4.09	5.96	0.017
Race	1	3.38	4.92	0.030
Hilow*Race	1	1.42	2.07	0.155
Sex	1	0.93	1.36	0.247
Hilow*Sex	1	1.10	1.61	0.209
Race*Sex	1	0.57	0.84	0.364
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	1.05	1.53	0.220

Dependent Variable: Item 55

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	7.06	1.00
Error	59	38.69	0.65
Corrected Total	66	45.76	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	2.75	4.20	0.044
Race	1	0.00	0.01	0.911
Hilow*Race	1	0.62	0.95	0.334
Sex	1	0.00	0.00	0.949
Hilow*Sex	1	3.64	5.56	0.021
Race*Sex	1	0.21	0.32	0.571
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	0.00	0.00	1.000

B. High/Low X Sex Interaction

Dependent Variable: Item 12

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	21.98	3.14
Error	60	77.23	1.28
Corrected Total	67	99.22	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	9.85	7.65	0.007
Race	1	1.57	1.22	0.273
Hilow*Race	1	2.00	1.55	0.217
Sex	1	0.00	0.00	0.974
Hilow*Sex	1	4.86	3.78	0.056
Race*Sex	1	4.49	3.49	0.066
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	0.00	0.00	1.000

Dependent Variable: Item 13

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	21.54	3.07
Error	61	67.00	1.09
Corrected Total	68	88.55	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	1.99	1.82	0.182
Race	1	6.88	6.27	0.015
Hilow*Race	1	1.23	1.12	0.294
Sex	1	4.57	4.17	0.045
Hilow*Sex	1	8.39	7.64	0.007
Race*Sex	1	0.08	0.07	0.786
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	0.00	0.00	1.000

Dependent Variable: Item 14

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	12.03	1.71
Error	59	49.03	0.83
Corrected Total	66	61.07	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	0.05	0.06	0.800
Race	1	1.24	1.50	0.225
Hilow*Race	1	0.65	0.79	0.377
Sex	1	1.67	2.02	0.160
Hilow*Sex	1	9.27	11.16	0.001
Race*Sex	1	0.00	0.00	1.000
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	0.00	0.00	1.000

```
Dependent Variable: Item 16

Source                 DF        Sum of Squares         Mean Square

Model                   7            15.22                 2.17

Error                  59            72.71                 1.23

Corrected Total        66            87.94

Source                 DF           Anova SS       F Value        PR F

Hilow                   1             2.24           1.83         0.181
Race                    1             1.14           0.93         0.339
Hilow*Race              1             0.50           0.41         0.524
Sex                     1             2.87           2.34         0.131
Hilow*Sex               1             8.36           6.79         0.011
Race*Sex                1             0.00           0.00         1.000
Hilow*Race*Sex          1             0.18           0.15         0.699


Dependent Variable: Item 17

Source                 DF        Sum of Squares         Mean Square

Model                   7             9.45                 1.35

Error                  61            71.78                 1.17

Corrected Total        68            81.24

Source                 DF           Anova SS       F Value        PR F

Hilow                   1             0.17           0.15         0.701
Race                    1             0.08           0.07         0.790
Hilow*Race              1             2.84           2.42         0.124
Sex                     1             0.30           0.26         0.613
Hilow*Sex               1             4.47           3.81         0.055
Race*Sex                1             1.73           1.48         0.229
Hilow*Race*Sex          1             0.00           0.00         1.000


Dependent Variable: Item 21

Source                 DF        Sum of Squares         Mean Square

Model                   7            20.82                 2.97

Error                  60            71.80                 1.19

Corrected Total        67            92.63

Source                 DF           Anova SS      F Value         PR F

Hilow                   1             1.61          1.35          0.249
Race                    1             0.35          0.30          0.586
Hilow*Race              1             2.29          1.92          0.171
Sex                     1             5.10          4.27          0.043
Hilow*Sex               1             4.68          3.91          0.052
Race*Sex                1             7.25          6.07          0.016
Hilow*Race*Sex          1             0.00          0.00          1.000
```

```
Dependent Variable: Item 25

Source                  DF        Sum of Squares        Mean Square

Model                    7            19.82                 2.83

Error                   62            73.04                 1.17

Corrected Total         69            92.87

Source                  DF          Anova SS       F Value        PR F

Hilow                    1             4.42          3.76         0.057
Race                     1             2.42          2.06         0.156
Hilow*Race               1             2.52          2.14         0.148
Sex                      1             2.63          2.24         0.139
Hilow*Sex                1             4.53          3.85         0.054
Race*Sex                 1             3.79          3.22         0.077
Hilow*Race*Sex           1             0.00          0.00         1.000


Dependent Variable: Item 26

Source                  DF        Sum of Squares        Mean Square

Model                    7            11.23                 1.60

Error                   60            76.82                 1.28

Corrected Total         67            88.05

Source                  DF          Anova SS       F Value        PR F

Hilow                    1             0.13          0.11         0.742
Race                     1             0.67          0.53         0.469
Hilow*Race               1             3.51          2.74         0.103
Sex                      1             2.03          1.59         0.212
Hilow*Sex                1             4.97          3.88         0.053
Race*Sex                 1             0.66          0.52         0.473
Hilow*Race*Sex           1             0.00          0.00         1.000


Dependent Variable: Item 27

Source                  DF        Sum of Squares        Mean Square

Model                    7            15.81                 2.25

Error                   58           120.62                 2.07

Corrected Total         65           136.43

Source                  DF          Anova SS       F Value        PR F

Hilow                    1             0.00          0.00         0.960
Race                     1             2.54          1.23         0.272
Hilow*Race               1             2.15          1.04         0.312
Sex                      1             0.50          0.24         0.622
Hilow*Sex                1             9.39          4.52         0.037
Race*Sex                 1             2.40          1.16         0.286
Hilow*Race*Sex           1             0.00          0.00         1.000
```

Dependent Variable: Item 47

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	9.36	1.33
Error	60	53.51	0.89
Corrected Total	67	62.88	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	0.64	0.73	0.397
Race	1	0.07	0.09	0.767
Hilow*Race	1	1.96	2.20	0.143
Sex	1	0.54	0.61	0.437
Hilow*Sex	1	4.47	5.02	0.028
Race*Sex	1	0.03	0.04	0.841
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	1.62	1.82	0.182

Dependent Variable: Item 48

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	20.27	2.89
Error	61	42.01	0.68
Corrected Total	68	62.28	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	1.31	1.91	0.171
Race	1	2.30	3.35	0.072
Hilow*Race	1	5.64	8.20	0.005
Sex	1	0.82	1.19	0.279
Hilow*Sex	1	7.13	10.37	0.002
Race*Sex	1	2.56	3.73	0.058
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	0.48	0.70	0.406

Dependent Variable: Item 50

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	12.50	1.78
Error	60	43.30	0.72
Corrected Total	67	55.80	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	3.84	5.33	0.024
Race	1	0.67	0.94	0.336
Hilow*Race	1	2.59	3.59	0.063
Sex	1	0.34	0.47	0.494
Hilow*Sex	1	2.74	3.81	0.055
Race*Sex	1	0.84	1.17	0.283
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	1.45	2.02	0.160

Dependent Variable: Item 55

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	7	7.06	1.00
Error	59	38.69	0.65
Corrected Total	66	45.76	

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	PR F
Hilow	1	2.75	4.20	0.044
Race	1	0.00	0.01	0.911
Hilow*Race	1	0.62	0.95	0.334
Sex	1	0.00	0.00	0.949
Hilow*Sex	1	3.64	5.56	0.021
Race*Sex	1	0.21	0.32	0.571
Hilow*Race*Sex	1	0.00	0.00	1.000

APPENDIX C

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher Questionnaire

☐ ☐ ☐ School Name

☐ Race/Sex

1. White Male	3. Black Male	5. Other Male
2. White Female	4. Black Female	6. Other Female

☐ Subject observed

1. English
2. Math
3. Science
4. Social Studies
5. Other

☐ Major Teaching Area

1. English
2. Math
3. Science
4. Social Studies
5. Other

☐ Period Observed

1. First
2. Second
3. Third
4. Fourth
5. Fifth
6. Sixth
7. Seventh
8. Eighth

Including this year:

☐ ☐ Number of years teaching
☐ ☐ Number of years with Jefferson County Public Schools
☐ ☐ Number of years assigned to this school

☐ Certification

1. Rank III
2. Rank III + 15
3. Rank II
4. Rank II + 15
5. Rank I

In the class observed list the number of:

☐ ☐ White Males	☐ ☐ Black Males	☐ ☐ Other Males
☐ ☐ White Females	☐ ☐ Black Females	☐ ☐ Other Females

Teacher Questionnaire

Directions:

A number of behavioral and/or descriptive statements that apply to the principal, staff, and students of a school are listed below. You are to respond to these statements as they apply within the school to which you are presently assigned. Your response is to be made using the following scale:

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

Circle the one number, 1 thru 5, that you feel is most appropriate for the particular school to which you are presently assigned.

1. The principal takes primary responsibility for discipline procedures in this school.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

2. Someone(s) other than the principal takes primary responsibility for disciplinary procedures in this school.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

3. The principal takes primary responsibility for the instructional program in the school.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

4. Someone(s) other than the principal takes primary responsibility for the instructional program in this school.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

5. The principal takes primary responsibility for overall operation of the school.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

6. Someone(s) other than the principal takes primary responsibility for the overall operation of this school.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

7. The principal is enthusiastic and tries to share this enthusiasm with students and staff.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

8. The principal is seen in the halls and cafeteria interacting with students and staff.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

9. The principal is considerate of the feelings of others.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

10. The principal displays a sense of humor.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

11. The principal works hard.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

12. The principal is the driving force in this school.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

13. The school's goals and objectives are clear.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

14. The school moves toward accomplishment of its goals and objectives.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

15. The principal encourages new ideas from the staff.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

16. The principal encourages new ideas from the students.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

17. The principal elicits output and production from school personnel.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

18. This school encourages assemblies and large group activities.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

19. This school supports a variety of co-curricular activities other than athletics.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

20. The principal is a likeable person.

   1. Almost always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Almost never

21. The principal waits to hear the facts in a case before making a decision.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

22. Many times the principal has no control over policies that must be enforced. In these cases the principal tries to make such policies more palatable.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

23. The principal attempts to deal with potential problem situations before a major problem develops.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

24. The principal encourages community involvement.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

25. The principal is sympathetic to the needs of teachers.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

26. The principal makes every effort to understand concerns of the student.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

27. The principal is receptive to constructive criticism concerning his/her performance as an administrator.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

28. The principal effectively balances community pressure with realities of school operation.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

29. The principal accepts the stipulations of the contract negotiated with teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

30. The principal abides by the stipulation of the contract negotiated with teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

31. The rules of the schools are enforced.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

32. The student is the primary focus in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

33. Students being disciplined are judged by the facts in the case rather than by reputation.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

34. The principal is supportive of the teacher in discipline situations.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

35. People are more important than rules in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

36. When disciplinary reasons cause a student to be sent to the office, the problem is generally handled satisfactorily.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

37. The school's disciplinary procedures are consistently enforced.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

38. Students feel free to talk with principal and share things with him or her.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

39. In disciplinary procedures, the principal will support a student if the teacher has made an error.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

40. The school staff and administration collaborate to develop disciplinary procedures and guidelines.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

41. The school staff and administration collaborate to develop curricular and co-curricular policies.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

42. The principal solicits input from many sources when problems and needs present themselves.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

43. The principal acknowledges areas of needed improvements.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

44. The principal seems willing to accept and implement new methods and ideas.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

45. This school is a cheerful place.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

46. People are friendly in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

47. When a student has a problem, it is easy to find help.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

48. In this school teachers respect the students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

49. In this school students have respect for other students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

50. In this school students have respect for the teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

51. People are honest and sincere in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

52. Students find this school to be an enjoyable experience.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

53. In this school students are not afraid of other students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

54. Students feel welcomed and accepted at this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

55. The school provides a good learning environment.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

APPENDIX D

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Administrator Questionnaire

☐ ☐ ☐ School to which you are presently assigned.

☐ Current position.

1. Principal
2. Assistant Principal

☐ Sex/Race

1. WM
2. WF
3. BM
4. BF

☐ Certification Level

1. Rank 2
2. Rank 2 + 15
3. Rank 1

Including this year, state:

☐ ☐ The number of years as an educator

☐ ☐ The number of years as an administrator

☐ ☐ The number of years in your present position

☐ ☐ The number of years in the Jefferson County School System

Administrator Questionnaire
Part One

Directions:

A number of student offenses are listed below. You are to rate each offense on a scale of 1 to 5 according to the degree of administrative discretion you as a principal use in deciding if the student should be suspended upon referral for each specific offense. Do not compare one offense with another; consider each independently. A formal definition of each offense from the Uniform Code of Student Discipline is attached to this instrument for further clarification. The scaled responses to be used throughout this instrument are as follows:

1. Formal record* may or may not be consulted; decision to suspend is automatic based on definition of offense in the Uniform Code of Student Discipline.
2. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on history of referrals for the same offense.
3. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on the cumulative effect of a history of referrals for various offenses.
4. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on principal's judgement of what is best for the student and/or the school, considering the principal's knowledge of the student's reputation and the seriousness of the offense.
5. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is primarily based on principal's personal like or dislike of the student.

Circle one number, 1 thru 5, on the scale under each offense to indicate the amount of administrative discretion you use in deciding if a student is to be suspended for that offense. These points may not exactly describe what you do in every case; select the point which most clearly describes your consideration in making the decision to suspend.

---

*For the purposes of this instrument, "formal record" means a file, card index, or some system of recording student discipline referrals which the principal maintains for his/her own use.

1. Formal record may or may not be consulted; decision to suspend is automatic based on definition of offense in the Uniform Code of Student Discipline.
2. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on history of referrals for the same offense.
3. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on the cumulative effect of a history of referrals for various offenses.
4. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on principal's judgement of what is best for the student and/or the school, considering the principal's knowledge of the student's reputation and the seriousness of the offense.
5. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is primarily based on principal's personal like or dislike of the student.

1. Student Disruption:

   1 2 3 4 5

2. Violation of Condition of Short Term Suspension:

   1 2 3 4 5

3. Assault:

   1 2 3 4 5

4. Excessive Verbal Abuse:

   1 2 3 4 5

5. Use or Possession of Illegal Drugs, Materials or Substances:

   1 2 3 4 5

6. Sale or Distribution of Illegal Drugs, Materials and Substances:

   1 2 3 4 5

7. Fighting:

   1 2 3 4 5

8. Use or Possession of Alcoholic Beverages:

   1 2 3 4 5

9. Sale or Distribution of Alcoholic Beverages:

   1 2 3 4 5

10. Discharging, Possession, Sale, or Distribution of Mild Fireworks or Explosions:

    1 2 3 4 5

1. Formal record may or may not be consulted; decision to suspend is automatic based on definition of offense in the Uniform Code of Student Discipline.

2. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on history of referrals for the same offense.

3. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on the cumulative effect of a history of referrals for various offenses.

4. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on principal's judgement of what is best for the student and/or the school, considering the principal's knowledge of the student's reputation and the seriousness of the offense.

5. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is primarily based on principal's personal like or dislike of the student.

11. Larceny:

1 2 3 4 5

12. Arson:

1 2 3 4 5

13. Disobedience and Insubordination:

1 2 3 4 5

14. Defacing School Property:

1 2 3 4 5

15. Possession of Deadly Weapons:

1 2 3 4 5

16. Disruptive Behavior on School Bus:

1 2 3 4 5

17. Interference with or Intimidation of Faculty Staff Personnel and Students:

1 2 3 4 5

18. Theft by Extortion:

1 2 3 4 5

19. Robbery:

1 2 3 4 5

20. Bomb Threat:

1 2 3 4 5

1. Formal record may or may not be consulted; decision to suspend is automatic based on definition of offense in the Uniform Code of Student Discipline.
2. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on history of referrals for the same offense.
3. Formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on the cumulative effect of a history of referrals for various offenses.
4. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is based on principal's judgement of what is best for the student and/or the school, considering the principal's knowledge of the student's reputation and the seriousness of the offense.
5. No formal records consulted; decision to suspend is primarily based on principal's personal like or dislike of the student.

21. Fighting or Striking a Faculty or Staff Member:

1 2 3 4 5

22. Discharge, Possession, Sale, or Distribution of Fireworks and Explosives:

1 2 3 4 5

23. Repetition of Long Term Suspendable Offense:

1 2 3 4 5

24. Cutting School, Cutting Class, and Tardiness:

1 2 3 4 5

25. Fire Alarm:

1 2 3 4 5

26. Other Illegal Conduct:

1 2 3 4 5

27. Gambling:

1 2 3 4 5

28. Repetition of Short Term Suspendable Offense:

1 2 3 4 5

29. Violation of Condition of Long Term Suspension:

1 2 3 4 5

30. Smoking in Unauthorized Area:

1 2 3 4 5

Administrator Questionnaire
Part Two

Directions:

A number of behavioral and/or descriptive statements that apply to the principal, staff, and students of a school are listed below. You are to respond to these statements as they apply within the school to which you are presently assigned. Your response is to be made using the following scale:

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

Circle the one number, 1 thru 5, that you feel is most appropriate for the particular school to which you are presently assigned.

31. The principal takes primary responsibility for discipline procedures in this school.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

32. Someone(s) other than the principal takes primary responsibility for disciplinary procedures in this school.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

33. The principal takes primary responsibility for the instructional program in the school.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

34. Someone(s) other than the principal takes primary responsibility for the instructional program in this school.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

35. The principal takes primary responsibility for overall operation of the school.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

36. Someone(s) other than the principal takes primary responsibility for the overall operation of this school.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

37. The principal is enthusiastic and tries to share this enthusiasm with students and staff.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

38. The principal is seen in the halls and cafeteria interacting with students and staff.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

39. The principal is considerate of the feelings of others.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

40. The principal displays a sense of humor.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

41. The principal works hard.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

42. The principal is the driving force in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

43. The school's goals and objectives are clear.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

44. The school moves toward accomplishment of its goals and objectives.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

45. The principal encourages new ideas from the staff.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

46. The principal encourages new ideas from the students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

47. The principal elicits output and production from school personnel.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

48. This school encourages assemblies and large group activities.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

49. This school supports a variety of co-curricular activities other than athletics.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

50. The principal is a likeable person.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

51. The principal waits to hear the facts in a case before making a decision.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

52. Many times the principal has no control over policies that must be enforced. In these cases the principal tries to make such policies more palatable.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

53. The principal attempts to deal with potential problem situations before a major problem develops.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

54. The principal encourages community involvement.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

55. The principal is sympathetic to the needs of teachers.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

56. The principal makes every effort to understand concerns of the student.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

57. The principal is receptive to constructive criticism concerning his/her performance as an administrator.
    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

58. The principal effectively balances community pressure with realities of school operation.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

59. The principal accepts the stipulations of the contract negotiated with teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

60. The principal abides by the stipulation of the contract negotiated with teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

61. The rules of the schools are enforced.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

62. The student is the primary focus in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

63. Students being disciplined are judged by the facts in the case rather than by reputation.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

64. The principal is supportive of the teacher in discipline situations.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

144

65. People are more important than rules in this school.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

66. When disciplinary reasons cause a student to be sent to the office, the problem is generally handled satisfactorily.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

67. The school's disciplinary procedures are consistently enforced.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

68. Students feel free to talk with principal and share things with him or her.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

69. In disciplinary procedures, the principal will support a student if the teacher has made an error.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

70. The school staff and administration collaborate to develop disciplinary procedures and guidelines.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

71. The school staff and administration collaborate to develop curricular and co-curricular policies.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

72. The principal solicits input from many sources when problems and needs present themselves.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

73. The principal acknowledges areas of needed improvements.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

74. The principal seems willing to accept and implement new methods and ideas.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

75. This school is a cheerful place.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

76. People are friendly in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

77. When a student has a problem, it is easy to find help.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

78. In this school teachers respect the students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

79. In this school students have respect for other students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

80. In this school students have respect for the teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

81. People are honest and sincere in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

82. Students find this school to be an enjoyable experience.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

83. In this school students are not afraid of other students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

84. Students feel welcomed and accepted at this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

85. The school provides a good learning environment.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

Definition of Offenses as Outlined in
Uniform Code of Student Conduct
Adopted November 1977

1. Student Disruptions - Any form of participation by the student which results in disruption of the normal educational process.

2. Violation of the conditions of Short-Term Suspension - Any violation of the rule prohibiting the entering of the school or school grounds, day or night, (except for a pre-arranged conference with an administrator), or riding a school bus.

3. Assault - The intent to physically injure a student, faculty member, or other school personnel by means of a deadly weapon, dangerous instrument, or intentionally or wantonly causing physical injury to a student, teacher or other school personnel.

4. Excessive Verbal Abuse - Name calling, racial slurs, or derogatory statements addressed to others which cause disruption of the school program, and/or incite violence.

5. Use or Possession of Illegal Drugs, Materials, or Substances - Using or possessing illegal drugs, materials, orsubstances on school property of at school functions, including bringing such items into the school for amother person, or having such items on one's person or placing them in a locker or hiding place.

6. Sale or Distribution of Illegal Drugs, Material, or Substances - Selling or distributing illegal drugs, materials, or substances on school property or at school functions.

7. Fighting - The use of serious bodily force between two or more students.

8. Use or Possession of Alcoholic Beverages - Using or possessing alcoholic beverages on school property or at school functions, including bringing such items into the school for another person or having such items on one's person or placing them in a locker or hiding place.

9. Sale or Distribution of Alcoholic Beverages - Selling or distributing alcoholic beverages on school property or at school functions.

10. Discharge, Possession, Sale or Distribution of Mild Fireworks or Explosives - The discharging, possessing, selling, or distributing of mild fireworks or explosives in any school building or upon any school property.

11. Larcency - The taking or exercise of control over movable property or that of the school to benefit oneself or some other person.

12. Arson - The damaging of a school building or the property of school personnel by starting a fire or causing an explosion when it is reasonable to believe that damage will result.

13. Disobedience and Insubordination - The willful disregard by a student to accept optional in-school measures or a refusal by such a student to respond to any reasonable directives of authorized school personnel, including failure to identify oneself.

14. Defacing School Property - The destroying or damaging or school property or the property of school personnel, or the property of a student, by a person having no right to do so or any reasonable grounds to believe that he/she has such a right.

15. Possession of Deadly Weapons - Carrying, using or storing deadly weapons on school property.

16. Disruptive Behavior on School Bus -

    a) Disruptive behavior on a school bus enroute to or from school or at a school bus stop.

    b) Behavior on a school bus which jeopardizes the safety of students or the safe operation of the bus is cause for mandatory suspension to the central office.

    c) Suspension for bus behavior shall be levied by the principal of the pupil's assigned school.

    d) The decision to prohibit a student from school bus transportation shall be made by the principal and not by the bus driver.

    e) Suspension for bus behavior shall follow the procedures as stipulated in the Jefferson County Public Schools policy J15.800 No. 3.

17. Interference with or Intimidation of Faculty, Staff Personnel and Students - Preventing or attempting to prevent faculty and staff and/or students from engaging in their lawful duties through threats, violence, or harassment.

18. Theft by Extortion - The obtainment of property of another by threatening to inflict bodily harm or injury.

19. Robbery - The commission of a theft by using immediate physical force upon another person by using a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument.

20. Bomb Threats - The making of false statements for the purpose of causing an evacuation of a school building or place of assembly upon school grounds, including such statements made to school personnel and students as to their personal property.

21. Fighting or Striking a Faculty or Staff Member - The use of serious bodily force by a student upon a faculty of staff member shall constitute a mandatory suspension.

22. Discharge, Possession, Sale or Distribution of Fireworks and Explosives - The discharging, selling, or distribution of fireworks or explosives in any school building or upon school property.

23. Repeated Violations - Repetition of long term suspendable offenses in which other corrective measures have failed.

24. Cutting School, Cutting Class, and Tardiness - See Addemdum, page 18.

ADDENDUM

Short term Suspension may be applicable for the following attendance related offenses.

1. The accumulation of three (3) or more days of non- attendance within a trimester.

   (Leaving home to go to school but not attending classes)

   Note: Suspension should be used as a last resort for this violation for students under the compulsory attendance age.

2. The accumulation of three (3) or more periods of absence from class, without a valid excuse, within a given trimester.

3. The accumulation of nine (9) or more tardies to school or class, without a valid excuse, within a given trimester.

4. A student above the compulsory attendance age may be withdrawn for the remainder of the trimester when the accumulated absences exceed a total of sixteen (16) days. This action will take place only after the school has taken all available steps to remedy the problem.

25. Fire Alarms - The activation of a fire alarm for the purpose of causing evacuation of a school building or place of assembly upon school grounds, when a fire does not exist.

26. Other Illegal Conduct - Any and all conduct which constitutes a serious felony under the laws of the State of Kentucky.

150

27. Gambling

28. Repetition of Short Term Suspendable Offenses (two or more).

29. Violation of the Conditions for Long-Term Suspension - Any violation or the rule prohibiting the entering of the school, or school grounds, day or night (except for a pre-arranged conference with an administrator) or riding a school bus.

30. Smoking in an Unauthorized Area

APPENDIX E

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Student Questionnaire

☐ ☐ ☐ School Name

☐ Race/Sex

1. White Male
2. White Female
3. Black Male
4. Black Female
5. Other Male
6. Other Female

☐ Academic Class

1. English
2. Math
3. Science
4. Social Studies
5. Other

☐ Period

1. First
2. Second
3. Third
4. Fourth
5. Fifth
6. Sixth
7. Seventh
8. Eighth

☐ I am bused to this school from my home school:

1. Yes
2. No

☐ Counting this year I have been at this school:

1. One year
2. Two years
3. Three years
4. Four years
5. Five years or more

☐ Since coming to this school I have been suspended:

1. Never
2. One time
3. Two times
4. Three times
5. Four times
6. Five times
7. Six times or more

☐ I have been suspended this year:

1. Not at all
2. One time
3. Two times
4. Three times
5. Four times
6. Five times
7. Six times or more

☐ My grades are:

1. Above average
2. Average
3. Below average

Student Questionnaire

Part One

Directions:

The following statements are about what goes on in your classroom. The statements are about the class which you regularly have during this period. You are to respond to these statements as they apply to the class using the following scale:

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

Circle the number, 1 thru 5, that you feel most describes what happens in this classroom during this period.

Turn to the next page and begin

1. The teacher is interested in how students feel about things.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

2. The teacher is interested in how I feel about things.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

3. The teacher says nice things about what students do well.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

4. The teacher says nice things about what I do well.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

5. The teacher uses the thoughts and feelings of the students in explaining the class work.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

6. The teacher uses my thoughts and feelings in explaining the class work.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

7. During class the teacher directs questions to the students.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

8. During class the teacher directs questions to me.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

9. The teacher spends much of the class giving his/her ideas about the subject.

    1. Almost always
    2. Often
    3. Sometimes
    4. Seldom
    5. Almost never

10. The teacher spends a lot of time telling us what to do and how to do it.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

11. The teacher spends a lot of time telling me what to do and how to do it.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

12. The teacher spends a lot of time telling students what they do wrong.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

13. The teacher spends a lot of time telling me what I do wrong.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

14. The students answer questions asked by the teacher during class.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

15. I answer questions asked by the teacher during class.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

16. Students ask questions and bring up ideas of their own during class.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

17. I ask questions and bring up my own ideas in class.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

18. There are times when nothing is going on in the class.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

19. The teacher shows that he/she cares about how students feel by a pat on the back, a wink, a smile, or something like that.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

20. The teacher shows that he/she likes what students do with smiles or other friendly gestures.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

21. The teacher shows that he/she likes our ideas by the looks on his/her face, or a nod or something like that.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

22. I feel that the teacher's questions are directed right to me because he/she looks at me and moves near me when asking the question.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

23. When the teacher is talking to us, he/she knows when we are tired or bored.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

24. Even when the teacher tells us what to do or how to do it, he/she seems to be very interested in us. His/her face shows it.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

25. Even when the teacher tells me I'm wrong about something, he/she usually shows by some looks and actions that he/she still likes me.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

26. When students discuss or ask questions in class, the teacher listens very carefully.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

27. The teacher's facial expressions and actions say the same things that his/her words do.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

Student Questionnaire

Part Two

Directions:

A number of statements that apply to the principal, staff, and students of a school are listed below. You are to respond to these statements as they apply within the school to which you presently attend. Your response is to be made using the following scale:

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

Circle the number, 1 thru 5, that you feel is most appropriate for the school which you presently attend.

Turn to next page and begin

28. Students look to the principal as the real leader of the school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

29. Teachers look to the principal as the real leader of the school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

30. The principal is excited about this school. The principal shares this excitement with students and teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

31. The principal is in the halls and cafeteria talking to students and teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

32. The principal seems to care about feelings of others.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

33. The principal shows a sense of humor.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

34. The principal works hard to make the school better.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

35. The principal is pleased by new ideas or outstanding work by students and teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

36. This school has assemblies and large group activities.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

37. School clubs and other school related activities are supported by the school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

38. The principal is a likeable person.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

39. The principal is a person who can be trusted.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

40. The principal trusts students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

41. Students respect the principal.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

42. Teachers respect the principal.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

43. The principal waits for the facts in a case before making a decision.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

44. Many times the principal has no control over rules or policies that must be enforced. In these cases the principal tries to make them as reasonable as possible.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

45. The principal tries to figure out what might cause problems before they happen.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

46. The principal wants the parents to become involved with the school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

47. The principal tries to understand the needs of the student.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

48. The principal listens to suggestions about how the school could be improved.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

49 The principal makes sure that the school rules are enforced.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

50. In this school, students are the most important concern.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

51. People are more important than rules in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

52. When a student is being disciplined, he or she is judged by the facts in the case.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

53. When a student is sent to the office for discipline, it is for a serious offense.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

54. The school staff is consistent in enforcing the rules.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

55. Students talk to the principal and share things with him/her.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

56. When there is a problem between a student and teacher, the principal will listen to both the student's and the teacher's side of the story.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

57. The principal tries to get ideas from many people when problems present themselves.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

58. The principal is honest about areas that need improvement in the school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

59. The principal is willing to try out new ideas.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

60. This school is a cheerful place.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

61. People are friendly in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

62. When a student has a problem, it is easy to find help.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

63. In this school teachers respect the students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

64. In this school students have respect for other students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

65. In this school students have respect for the teachers.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

66. People are honest and sincere in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

67. I enjoy being at this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

68. In this school students are not afraid of other students.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

69. Students feel welcomed and accepted at this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

70. This school is a good place to learn.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

71. I like the students in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

72. I like the teachers in this school.

1. Almost always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Almost never

APPENDIX F

SUSPENSION DATA

Incidence of Suspension for 1978-79 School Year

School	Black			White			Total			Difference
	Population	Suspensions	%	Population	Suspensions	%	Population	Suspensions	%	%
Atherton	295	141	47.8	1,150	283	24.6	1,445	424	29.3	23.2
Ahrens	345	84	24.3	752	81	10.8	1,097	165	15.1	13.5
Ballard	343	332	96.8	1,383	277	20.1	1,726	609	35.3	76.7
Butler	471	604	128.2	1,042	366	35.1	1,513	970	64.1	93.1
Central	376	128	34.1	1,344	162	12.1	1,720	290	16.9	22.0
Doss	233	142	60.9	913	222	24.3	1,146	364	31.8	36.3
Durrett	163	74	45.4	1,011	193	19.1	1,174	267	22.7	26.3
Eastern	212	54	25.5	1,066	64	6.0	1,278	118	9.2	19.5
Fairdale	188	116	61.7	1,028	152	14.8	1,216	268	22.1	46.9
Fern Creek	244	185	75.8	1,146	219	19.1	1,390	404	29.1	56.7
Iroquois	601	351	58.4	1,368	229	16.7	1,969	580	29.5	41.7
Thomas Jeff.	571	331	57.9	1,521	373	24.5	2,092	704	33.7	33.4
Jeffersontown	297	114	38.4	1,201	75	6.2	1,498	189	12.6	32.2
Male	190	40	21.1	724	46	6.4	914	86	9.4	5.7
Manual	792	567	71.6	1,458	298	20.4	2,250	865	38.4	51.2
Moore	234	58	24.8	1,279	51	3.9	1,513	109	7.2	20.9
Pleasure Ridge	290	119	41.1	1,155	211	18.3	1,445	330	22.8	22.8
Seneca	276	46	16.7	939	95	10.1	1,215	141	11.6	6.6
Shawnee	301	186	61.8	1,000	232	23.2	1,301	418	32.1	38.6
Southern	254	210	82.7	1,442	503	34.9	1,696	713	42.1	47.8
Stuart	349	253	72.5	1,055	333	31.5	1,404	585	41.7	41.0
Valley	217	76	35.1	954	107	11.2	1,171	183	15.6	23.9
Waggener	220	76	34.5	912	73	8.0	1,132	149	13.2	26.5
Western	380	204	53.7	1,328	291	21.9	1,708	495	28.9	31.8
Westport	261	267	102.3	870	194	22.3	1,131	461	40.8	80.0
TOTAL	8,103	4,758	58.7	28,041	5,129	18.3	36,144	9,887	27.4	40.4

Suspension Rates

School	1974-1975		1975-1976		1976-1977		1977-1978		1978-1979	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Atherton	0	0	29.8	3.6	33.1	7.9	46.1	16.5	47.8	24.6
Ahrens	58.1	23.2	23.2	12.3	49.9	22.6	52.7	20.1	24.3	10.8
Ballard	4.2	6.9	171.1	15.5	114.8	17.2	127.4	25.0	96.8	20.1
Butler	21.2	8.8	91.7	7.9	68.2	8.4	150.7	26.3	128.2	35.1
Central	6.3	0	27.5	12.2	57.4	17.3	51.5	14.4	34.1	12.1
Doss	11.1	2.5	17.8	1.7	30.5	4.5	40.9	13.4	60.9	24.3
Durrett	10.0	3.8	114.5	27.6	93.3	25.9	88.5	28.1	45.4	19.1
Eastern	53.1	30.5	107.7	34.7	86.2	18.3	55.5	14.0	25.5	6.0
Fairdale	0	6.3	39.7	6.7	53.6	5.1	63.9	10.7	61.7	14.8
Fern Creek	20.8	21.7	109.2	17.7	137.5	28.9	122.7	32.1	75.8	19.1
Iroquois	25.0	14.6	132.8	2.8	35.2	19.4	63.5	15.3	58.4	16.7
T. Jefferson	29.4	9.4	37.4	14.5	40.6	15.3	77.7	27.7	57.9	24.5
Jeffersontown	10.0	10.7	40.7	12.7	43.5	6.9	44.1	9.3	38.4	6.2
Male	22.9	0	46.9	25.8	40.8	28.8	30.6	13.4	21.1	6.4
Manual	48.4	23.5	64.5	18.9	75.4	17.1	77.4	24.4	71.6	20.4
Moore	10.0	13.8	51.8	13.6	70.9	15.0	89.1	9.5	24.8	3.9
Pleasure Ridge	0	2.4	58.9	14.8	97.6	23.9	78.8	27.1	41.1	18.3
Seneca	13.7	9.3	57.2	23.5	31.5	8.6	23.4	11.3	16.7	10.1
Shawnee	13.4	0	21.4	7.2	52.7	16.1	61.0	17.6	61.8	23.2
Southern	0	2.6	81.9	16.9	108.8	33.6	87.3	29.6	82.7	34.9
Stuart	0	2.9	55.8	10.9	144.1	25.1	119.3	23.5	72.5	31.5
Valley	12.9	7.6	93.1	26.7	50.2	12.2	29.5	13.0	35.1	11.2
Waggener	33.3	7.4	78.6	10.1	34.8	5.6	53.8	7.2	34.5	8.0
Western	0	2.0	45.9	8.4	40.2	6.4	43.3	11.2	53.7	21.9
Westport	11.4	10.5	88.8	14.5	74.9	11.9	140.5	30.4	102.3	22.3
County $\overline{X}$	23.1	8.0	65.5	15.3	65.3	16.3	75.1	19.2	58.7	18.3
City $\overline{X}$	22.9	8.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Black:White
Incidences of Suspension

School	1976-1977	1977-1978	1978-1979
Atherton	4.2:1	2.8:1	1.9:1
Ahrens	2.2:1	2.6:1	2.3:1
Ballard	6.7:1	5.1:1	4.8:1
Butler	8.1:1	5.7:1	3.7:1
Central	3.3:1	3.7:1	2.8:1
Doss	7.1:1	3.1:1	2.5:1
Durrett	3.6:1	3.1:1	2.4:1
Eastern	4.7:1	4.0:1	4.3:1
Fairdale	10.5:1	6.0:1	4.2:1
Fern Creek	4.8:1	3.8:1	3.9:1
Iroqucis	1.8:1	4.2:1	3.5:1
Thomas Jeff.	2.7:1	2.8:1	2.4:1
Jeffersontown	6.3:1	4.7:1	6.2:1
Male	1.4:1	2.3:1	3.3:1
Manual	4.4:1	3.2:1	3.5:1
Moore	4.7:1	9.4:1	6.4:1
Pleasure Ridge	4.1:1	2.9:1	2.2:1
Seneca	4.1:1	2.1:1	1.6:1
Shawnee	3.3:1	3.5:1	2.7:1
Southern	3.2:1	2.9:1	2.4:1
Stuart	5.7:1	5.1:1	2.3:1
Valley	4.1:1	2.3:1	3.1:1
Waggener	6.2:1	7.5:1	4.3:1
Western	6.3:1	3.9:1	2.5:1
Westport	6.3:1	4.6:1	4.6:1
Total	4.0:1	3.9:1	3.2:1

Atherton High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	78	50	64.1	371	166	44.7	449	216	48.1
10	83	45	54.2	247	60	24.3	330	105	31.8
11	71	26	36.6	255	37	14.5	326	63	19.3
12	63	20	31.7	277	20	7.2	340	40	11.8
Total	295	141	47.8	1,150	283	24.6	1,445	424	29.3

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson			1	.4	1	.2
2. Assault on Staff						
3. Assault on Student	3	2.1	4	1.4	7	1.7
4. Burglary/Theft	7	5.0	4	1.4	11	2.6
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property			4	1.4	4	.9
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	34	24.1	56	19.8	90	21.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	22	15.7	15	5.3	37	8.7
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	2	1.4			2	.5
10. Excessive cutting of class	37	26.2	81	28.7	118	27.9
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)						
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.7	1	.4	2	.5
14. Fighting	5	3.5	4	1.4	9	2.1
15. Gambling	3	2.1			3	.7
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	2	1.4	10	3.5	12	2.8
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	7	5.0	10	3.5	17	4.0
19. Possession or selling of drugs	7	5.0	19	6.7	26	6.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	6	4.3	4	1.4	10	2.4
23. Selling goods illegally	1	.7			1	.2
24. Smoking in unassigned area	4	2.8	70	24.7	74	17.5
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	141	100.0	283	100.0	424	100.0

Ahrens High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	140	52	37.1	339	52	15.3	479	104	21.7
10	88	23	26.1	191	19	9.9	279	42	15.1
11	73	4	5.5	124	5	4.0	197	9	4.6
12	44	5	11.4	98	5	5.1	142	10	7.0
Total	345	84	24.3	752	81	10.8	1,097	165	15.1

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	2	2.4			2	1.2
2. Assault on Staff	2	2.4			2	1.2
3. Assault on Student						
4. Burglary/Theft	4	4.8			4	2.4
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property	1	1.2	2	2.5	3	1.8
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	14	16.6	9	11.1	23	13.9
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	7	8.3	12	14.8	19	11.5
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	27	32.1	18	22.2	45	27.4
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)						
13. Excessive tardiness (school)						
14. Fighting	9	10.7	23	28.5	32	19.5
15. Gambling	2	2.4			2	1.2
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	1.2			1	.6
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	4	4.8	4	4.9	8	4.8
19. Possession or selling of drugs			2	2.5	2	1.2
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	7	8.3	10	12.3	17	10.3
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	3.6	1	1.2	4	2.4
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)	1	1.2			1	.6
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	84	100.0	81	100.0	165	100.0

Ballard High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	128	206	160.9	342	104	30.4	470	310	66.0
10	95	78	82.1	324	65	20.1	419	143	34.1
11	73	40	54.8	386	64	16.6	459	104	22.7
12	47	8	17.0	331	44	13.3	378	52	13.8
Total	343	332	96.8	1,383	277	20.1	1,726	609	35.3

Suspensions by Offense

Offense	Black		White		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	4	1.2	1	.4	5	.8
3. Assault on Student	8	2.4			8	1.3
4. Burglary/Theft	16	4.8	2	.7	18	3.0
5. Bus Conduct	2	.6			2	.3
6. Destruction of Property	2	.6	8	2.9	10	1.6
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	93	28.0	17	6.1	110	18.1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	48	14.4	30	10.8	78	12.8
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	1	.3	4	1.4	5	.8
10. Excessive cutting of class	66	19.0	113	40.9	179	29.3
11. Extortion	1	.3			1	.2
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	13	3.9	9	3.2	22	3.6
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	2	.6			2	.3
14. Fighting	34	10.2	8	2.9	42	6.9
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	4	1.2	1	.4	5	.8
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages			2	.7	2	.3
19. Possession or selling of drugs	13	3.9	27	9.7	40	6.6
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			1	.4	1	.2
21. Possession of weapons	1	.6			1	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	16	4.8	12	4.3	28	4.6
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	7	2.1	41	14.8	48	7.9
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)			1	.4	1	.2
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code	1	.3			1	.2
Totals	332	100.0	277	100.0	609	100.0

Butler High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	202	375	185.7	294	173	58.9	496	548	110.5
10	111	89	80.2	244	47	19.2	355	136	38.3
11	95	110	115.8	258	93	36.0	353	203	57.5
12	63	30	47.6	246	53	21.5	309	83	26.9
Total	471	604	128.2	1,042	366	35.1	1,513	970	64.1

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	5	.8	2	.5	7	.7
2. Assault on Staff	1	.2			1	.1
3. Assault on Student	6	1.0			6	.6
4. Burglary/Theft	6	1.0			6	.6
5. Bus Conduct	2	.3			2	.2
6. Destruction of Property	1	.2			1	.1
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	59	9.8	3	.8	62	6.4
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	52	8.6	11	3.0	63	6.5
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	1	.2	1	.3	2	.2
10. Excessive cutting of class	273	45.1	190	51.9	463	47.8
11. Extortion	1	.2			1	.1
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	112	18.5	113	30.9	225	23.3
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	13	2.2	13	3.6	26	2.7
14. Fighting	38	6.3	4	1.1	42	4.3
15. Gambling	2	.3			2	.2
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	3	.5	1	.3	4	.4
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	4	.7	7	1.9	11	1.1
19. Possession or selling of drugs	4	.7	16	4.4	20	2.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	2	.3	3	.8	5	.5
21. Possession of weapons	2	.3			2	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	9	1.5			9	.9
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	5	.8	2	.5	7	.7
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code	3	.5			3	.3
Totals	604	100.0	366	100.0	970	100.0

Central High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	129	79	61.2	331	43	13.0	460	122	26.5
10	98	34	34.5	355	61	17.2	453	95	21.0
11	85	8	9.1	377	38	10.1	462	46	10.0
12	64	7	10.9	281	20	7.1	345	27	7.8
Total	376	128	34.1	1,344	162	12.1	1,720	290	16.9

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	1	.8	3	1.9	4	1.4
2. Assault on Staff	3	2.3	1	.6	4	1.4
3. Assault on Student	5	3.9	2	1.2	7	2.4
4. Burglary/Theft	4	3.1	4	2.5	8	2.8
5. Bus Conduct	2	1.6	2	1.2	4	1.4
6. Destruction of Property						
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	15	11.7	8	4.9	23	7.9
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	14	10.9	16	9.9	30	10.3
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	6	4.7	29	17.9	35	12.1
10. Excessive cutting of class	34	26.6	48	29.6	82	28.3
11. Extortion	4	3.1			4	1.4
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	7	5.5	4	2.5	11	3.8
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.8			1	.3
14. Fighting	9	7.0	10	6.2	19	6.6
15. Gambling	1	.8			1	.3
16. Indecent Exposure			1	.6	1	.3
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	.8	1	.6	2	.7
19. Possession or selling of drugs	2	1.6	14	8.7	16	5.5
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons	1	.8			1	.3
22. Profanity or vulgarity	3	2.3	1	.6	4	1.4
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	15	11.7	12	7.4	27	9.3
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation			6	3.7	6	2.1
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	128	100.0	162	100.0	290	100.0

Doss High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	79	76	96.2	236	98	41.5	315	174	55.2
10	63	33	52.4	232	56	24.1	295	89	30.2
11	67	23	34.3	207	27	13.0	274	50	18.2
12	24	10	41.7	238	41	17.2	262	51	19.5
Total	233	142	60.9	913	222	24.3	1,146	364	31.8

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	1	.7			1	.3
3. Assault on Student	3	2.1	1	.5	4	1.1
4. Burglary/Theft	4	2.8			4	1.1
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property	2	1.4	1	.5	3	.8
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	32	22.6	10	4.5	42	11.6
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	25	17.6	12	5.4	37	10.2
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	2	1.4			2	.5
10. Excessive cutting of class	29	20.5	65	29.3	94	25.8
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	1	.7	18	8.1	19	5.2
13. Excessive tardiness (school)			23	10.3	23	6.3
14. Fighting	34	23.9	28	12.5	62	17.1
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	.7	24	10.7	25	6.9
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages			9	4.1	9	2.5
19. Possession or selling of drugs	2	1.4	17	7.7	19	5.2
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	1	.7	1	.5	2	.5
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	2	1.4	2	.9	4	1.1
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	2.1	5	2.3	8	2.2
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)			6	2.7	6	1.6
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	142	100.0	222	100.0	364	100.0

Durrett High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	54	41	75.9	336	101	30.1	390	142	36.4
10	35	23	65.7	230	45	19.6	265	68	25.7
11	38	9	23.7	225	28	12.4	263	37	14.1
12	36	1	2.8	220	19	8.6	256	20	7.8
Total	163	74	45.4	1,011	193	19.1	1,174	267	22.7

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff			1	.5	1	.4
3. Assault on Student			5	2.6	5	1.9
4. Burglary/Theft	1	1.4	1	.5	2	.7
5. Bus Conduct			1	.5	1	.4
6. Destruction of Property			2	1.0	2	.7
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	19	25.6	32	16.6	51	19.1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	6	8.1	15	7.8	21	7.9
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	16	21.6	68	35.3	84	31.5
11. Extortion	2	2.7			2	.7
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	8	10.8	9	4.7	17	6.4
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	4	5.4	23	11.9	27	10.1
14. Fighting	12	16.2	10	5.2	22	8.2
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages			1	.5	1	.4
19. Possession or selling of drugs			6	3.1	6	2.2
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			1	.5	1	.4
21. Possession of weapons	1	1.4			1	.4
22. Profanity or vulgarity	3	4.1	10	5.2	13	4.9
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	2	2.7	8	4.1	10	3.7
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	74	100.0	193	100.0	267	100.0

Eastern High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	82	8	9.7	242	8	3.3	324	16	4.9
10	46	9	19.6	279	10	3.6	325	19	5.8
11	54	28	51.9	291	36	12.4	345	64	18.6
12	30	9	30.0	254	10	3.9	284	19	6.7
Total	212	54	25.5	1,066	64	6.0	1,278	118	9.2

Suspensions by Offense

Offense	Black		White		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson			1	1.6	1	.8
2. Assault on Staff						
3. Assault on Student						
4. Burglary/Theft	13	24.1	2	3.1	15	12.7
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property	1	1.9	1	1.6	2	1.7
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	17	31.5	1	1.6	18	15.4
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	2	3.7	1	1.6	3	2.5
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	3	5.6	25	39.0	28	23.8
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	4	7.4	5	7.8	9	7.6
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	4	7.4	9	14.1	13	11.0
14. Fighting	2	3.7	4	6.3	6	5.1
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	1.9	2	3.1	3	2.5
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	2	3.7	2	3.1	4	3.4
19. Possession or selling of drugs	3	5.6	8	12.5	11	9.3
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	1.9			1	.8
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area			2	3.1	2	1.7
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)	1	1.9	1	1.6	2	1.7
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	54	100.0	64	100.0	118	100.0

Fairdale High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	60	55	91.7	333	69	20.7	393	124	31.6
10	57	44	77.2	273	65	23.8	330	109	33.1
11	45	13	28.9	234	12	5.1	279	25	8.9
12	26	4	15.4	188	6	3.2	214	10	4.7
Total	188	116	61.7	1,028	152	14.8	1,216	268	22.1

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	3	2.6	4	2.6	7	2.6
2. Assault on Staff	3	2.6	5	3.3	8	2.8
3. Assault on Student	3	2.6	3	2.0	6	2.2
4. Burglary/Theft	3	2.6	2	1.3	5	1.9
5. Bus Conduct	4	3.5	2	1.3	6	2.2
6. Destruction of Property	1	.9	2	1.3	3	1.1
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	29	25.0	21	13.8	50	18.8
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	20	17.2	10	6.6	30	11.2
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	2	1.7			2	.7
10. Excessive cutting of class	8	6.9	19	12.5	27	10.1
11. Extortion	1	.9			1	.4
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	5	4.3	6	3.9	11	4.1
13. Excessive tardiness (school)			4	2.6	4	1.5
14. Fighting	20	17.2	35	23.0	55	20.6
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	2	1.7	2	1.3	4	1.5
19. Possession or selling of drugs			30	19.7	30	11.2
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			1	.7	1	.4
21. Possession of weapons	2	1.7	1	.7	3	1.1
22. Profanity or vulgarity	7	6.0	1	.7	8	3.0
23. Selling goods illegally			1	.7	1	.4
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	2.6	3	2.0	6	2.2
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	116	100.0	152	100.0	268	100.0

Fern Creek High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	67	86	128.4	348	105	30.2	415	191	46.0
10	63	59	93.7	256	44	17.2	319	103	32.3
11	66	30	45.5	309	49	15.9	375	79	21.1
12	48	10	20.8	233	21	9.0	281	31	11.0
Total	244	185	75.8	1,146	[illegible]9	19.1	1,390	404	29.1

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	1	.5			1	.2
3. Assault on Student	1	.5	1	.5	2	.5
4. Burglary/Theft	3	1.6			3	.7
5. Bus Conduct	6	3.2	2	.9	8	2.0
6. Destruction of Property	1	.5	4	1.8	5	1.2
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	22	11.9	10	4.6	32	7.9
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	51	27.6	31	14.2	82	20.4
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	41	22.2	78	35.5	119	29.6
11. Extortion			1	.5	1	.2
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	14	7.6	20	9.1	34	8.4
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	7	3.8	12	5.5	19	4.7
14. Fighting	20	10.8	22	10.0	42	10.4
15. Gambling	2	1.1			2	.5
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages						
19. Possession or selling of drugs	8	4.3	32	14.6	40	9.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			3	1.4	3	.7
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	4	2.2			4	1.0
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	2	1.1	3	1.4	5	1.2
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code	2	1.1			2	.5
Totals	185	100.0	219	100.0	404	100.0

Iroquois High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	234	195	83.3	454	125	27.5	688	320	46.5
10	146	91	62.3	315	55	17.5	461	146	31.7
11	135	52	38.5	335	35	10.4	470	87	18.5
12	86	13	15.1	264	14	5.3	350	27	7.7
Total	601	351	58.4	1,368	229	16.7	1,969	580	29.5

Suspensions by Offense

Offense	Black		White		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	1	.3			1	.2
2. Assault on Staff	6	1.7	1	.4	7	1.2
3. Assault on Student	17	4.8	5	2.2	22	3.8
4. Burglary/Theft	4	1.1			4	.7
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property	3	.9	4	1.7	7	1.2
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	48	13.7	16	7.0	64	11.0
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	48	13.7	45	19.8	93	16.0
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)			1	.4	1	.2
10. Excessive cutting of class	59	16.8	43	18.8	102	17.6
11. Extortion	3	.9			3	.5
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	9	2.6	5	2.2	14	2.4
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	21	6.0	11	4.8	32	5.5
14. Fighting	77	21.8	23	10.0	100	17.2
15. Gambling	1	.3	1	.4	2	.3
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	.3	3	1.3	4	.7
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	2	.6	8	3.5	10	1.7
19. Possession or selling of drugs	34	9.7	51	22.4	85	14.7
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			1	.4	1	.2
21. Possession of weapons	1	.3			1	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	10	2.8	1	.4	11	1.9
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	4	1.1	1	.4	5	.9
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)	2	.6	9	3.9	11	1.9
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	351	100.0	229	100.0	580	100.0

Thomas Jefferson High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	175	155	88.6	456	127	27.9	631	282	44.7
10	159	98	61.6	382	84	22.0	541	182	33.6
11	138	56	40.6	378	116	30.7	516	172	33.3
12	99	22	22.2	305	46	15.1	404	68	16.8
Total	571	331	57.9	1,521	373	24.5	2,092	704	33.7

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	2	.6	1	.3	3	.4
3. Assault on Student	4	1.2	2	.5	6	.9
4. Burglary/Theft	6	1.8	1	.3	7	1.0
5. Bus Conduct			1	.3	1	.1
6. Destruction of Property	3	.9	3	.8	6	.9
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	58	17.6	25	6.7	83	11.8
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	59	17.9	34	9.1	93	13.1
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	2	.6	2	.5	4	.6
10. Excessive cutting of class	66	19.9	124	33.2	190	27.0
11. Extortion	2	.6			2	.3
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	45	13.6	31	8.3	76	10.8
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	16	4.8	12	3.2	28	4.0
14. Fighting	40	12.1	40	10.8	80	11.4
15. Gambling	2	.6	1	.3	3	.4
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing			1	.3	1	.1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	3	.9	21	5.6	24	3.4
19. Possession or selling of drugs	4	1.2	27	7.2	31	4.4
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	10	3.0	7	1.9	17	2.4
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	2	.6	12	3.2	14	2.0
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)	7	2.1	28	7.5	35	5.0
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	331	100.0	373	100.0	704	100.0

Jeffersontown High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	122	65	53.3	317	25	7.9	439	90	20.5
10	71	34	47.9	288	22	7.6	359	56	15.6
11	61	12	19.7	315	18	5.7	376	30	8.0
12	43	3	7.0	281	10	3.6	324	13	4.0
Total	297	114	38.4	1,201	75	6.2	1,498	189	12.6

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	2	1.8			2	1.1
3. Assault on Student	3	2.6			3	1.6
4. Burglary/Theft	3	2.6	1	1.3	4	2.1
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property	3	2.6			3	1.6
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	21	18.4	6	8.0	27	14.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	14	12.3	12	16.0	26	13.8
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	4	3.5	6	8.0	10	5.3
10. Excessive cutting of class	14	12.3	19	25.4	33	17.5
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	7	6.1	2	2.7	9	4.8
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.9			1	.5
14. Fighting	33	28.8	13	17.3	46	24.2
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure	2	1.8			2	1.1
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	.9			1	.5
19. Possession or selling of drugs	2	1.8	12	16.0	14	7.4
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	2	1.8	1	1.3	3	1.6
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	2	1.8	2	2.7	4	2.1
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)			1	1.3	1	.5
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	114	100.0	75	100.0	189	100.0

Male High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	82	12	14.6	324	24	7.4	406	36	8.9
10	56	19	33.9	223	11	4.9	279	30	10.8
11	36	7	19.4	117	10	8.5	153	17	11.1
12	16	2	12.5	60	1	1.6	76	3	3.9
Total	190	40	21.1	724	46	6.4	914	86	9.4

Suspensions by Offense

Offense	Black		White		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	1	2.5	1	2.2	2	2.3
2. Assault on Staff	1	2.5	3	6.5	4	4.7
3. Assault on Student			2	4.3	2	2.3
4. Burglary/Theft	2	5.0			2	2.3
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property						
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	7	17.5	1	2.2	8	9.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	4	10.0	4	8.7	8	9.3
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	3	7.5	9	19.6	12	14.0
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	5	12.5	1	2.2	6	7.0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	10	25.0	6	13.0	16	18.5
14. Fighting	6	15.0	6	13.0	12	14.0
15. Gambling			3	6.5	3	3.5
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages			1	2.2	1	1.2
19. Possession or selling of drugs						
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity			1	2.2	1	1.2
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	2.5	8	17.4	9	10.4
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	40	100.0	46	100.0	86	100.0

Manual High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	297	319	107.4	544	167	30.7	841	486	57.8
10	193	128	66.3	339	68	20.1	532	196	36.8
11	181	91	50.3	315	37	11.7	496	128	25.8
12	121	29	24.0	260	26	10.0	381	55	14.4
Total	792	567	71.6	1,458	298	20.4	2,250	865	38.4

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	2	.4			2	.2
2. Assault on Staff	8	1.4	1	.3	9	1.0
3. Assault on Student	12	2.1			12	1.4
4. Burglary/Theft	3	.5			3	.3
5. Bus Conduct			1	.3	1	.1
6. Destruction of Property	6	1.1	1	.3	7	.8
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	126	22.2	44	14.9	170	19.7
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	124	21.8	87	29.3	211	24.3
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	59	10.4	63	21.2	122	14.1
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	8	1.4	1	.3	9	1.0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	6	1.1	1	.3	7	.8
14. Fighting	60	10.6	23	7.7	83	9.8
15. Gambling	5	.9			5	.6
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	117	20.6	56	18.8	173	20.0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	10	1.8	1	.3	11	1.3
19. Possession or selling of drugs			1	.3	1	.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons	2	.4	2	.7	4	.5
22. Profanity or vulgarity	12	2.1	5	1.7	17	2.0
23. Selling goods illegally			3	1.0	3	.3
24. Smoking in unassigned area	7	1.2	7	2.3	14	1.6
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code			1	.3	1	.1
Totals	567	100.0	298	100.0	865	100.0

1-83

Moore High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	80	32	40.0	348	16	4.6	428	48	11.2
10	47	10	21.3	317	18	3.7	364	28	7.7
11	62	15	24.2	315	13	4.1	377	28	7.4
12	45	1	2.2	299	4	1.3	344	5	1.5
Total	234	58	24.8	1,279	51	3.9	1,513	109	7.2

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	1	1.7			1	.9
3. Assault on Student	3	5.2	1	2.0	4	3.7
4. Burglary/Theft	1	1.7	1	2.0	2	1.8
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property						
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	12	20.8	7	13.7	19	17.5
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	6	10.3	6	11.7	12	11.0
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	1	1.7	1	2.0	2	1.8
10. Excessive cutting of class	18	31.1	13	25.4	31	28.5
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	4	6.9	3	5.9	7	6.4
13. Excessive tardiness (school)						
14. Fighting	4	6.9	2	3.9	6	5.5
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages			2	3.9	2	1.8
19. Possession or selling of drugs	2	3.4	5	9.8	7	6.4
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			3	5.9	3	2.8
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	2	3.4	1	2.0	3	2.8
23. Selling goods illegally			1	2.0	1	.9
24. Smoking in unassigned area						
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)	3	5.2	5	9.8	8	7.3
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code	1	1.7			1	.9
Totals	58	100.0	51	100.0	109	100.0

Pleasure Ridge Park High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	93	66	71.0	354	116	32.8	447	182	40.7
10	75	30	40.0	266	52	19.5	341	82	24.0
11	73	13	17.8	280	24	8.6	353	37	10.5
12	49	10	20.4	255	19	7.6	304	29	9.5
Total	290	119	41.1	1,155	211	18.3	1,445	330	22.8

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	2	1.7	1	.5	3	.9
3. Assault on Student	1	.8			1	.3
4. Burglary/Theft	2	1.7			2	.6
5. Bus Conduct			3	1.4	3	.9
6. Destruction of Property			1	.5	1	.3
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	9	7.6	13	6.2	22	6.7
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	24	20.2	31	14.7	55	16.7
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)			1	.5	1	.3
10. Excessive cutting of class	32	26.9	71	33.6	103	31.3
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	15	12.6	3	1.4	18	5.5
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.8	3	1.4	4	1.2
14. Fighting	25	21.0	20	9.5	45	13.6
15. Gambling	2	1.7			2	.6
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing			1	.5	1	.3
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages						
19. Possession or selling of drugs	3	2.5	13	6.2	16	4.8
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	2	1.7	2	.9	4	1.2
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	.8	1	.5	2	.6
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)			2	.9	2	.6
26. Walkout participation			45	21.3	45	13.6
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	119	100.0	211	100.0	330	100.0

Seneca High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	94	19	20.2	260	32	12.3	354	51	14.4
10	73	15	20.5	235	34	14.5	308	49	15.9
11	54	4	7.4	216	15	6.9	270	19	7.0
12	55	8	14.5	228	14	6.1	283	22	7.8
Total	276	46	16.7	939	95	10.1	1,215	141	11.6

Suspensions by Offense

Offense	Black		White		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	3	6.5	3	3.2	6	4.3
3. Assault on Student	3	6.5	3	3.2	6	4.3
4. Burglary/Theft						
5. Bus Conduct	1	2.2			1	.7
6. Destruction of Property						
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	8	17.4	1	1.1	9	6.4
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	9	19.5	21	22.0	30	21.2
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	2	4.3	14	14.6	16	11.3
11. Extortion	1	2.2			1	.7
12. Excessive tardiness (class)			1	1.1	1	.7
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	2.2	5	5.3	6	4.3
14. Fighting	12	26.1	11	11.5	23	16.3
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing			1	1.1	1	.7
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages			1	1.1	1	.7
19. Possession or selling of drugs	2	4.3	19	20.0	21	14.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	1	2.2			1	.7
21. Possession of weapons	1	2.2			1	.7
22. Profanity or vulgarity			6	6.3	6	4.3
23. Selling goods illegally	1	2.2			1	.7
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	2.2	2	2.1	3	2.1
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)			7	7.4	7	5.0
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	46	100.0	95	100.0	141	100.0

Shawnee High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	91	72	79.1	320	94	29.4	411	166	40.4
10	92	63	68.5	294	71	24.1	386	134	34.7
11	67	36	53.7	239	39	16.3	306	75	24.5
12	51	15	29.4	147	28	19.0	198	43	21.7
Total	301	186	61.8	1,000	232	23.2	1,301	418	32.1

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	1	.5			1	.2
2. Assault on Staff	1	.5	2	.9	3	.7
3. Assault on Student	5	2.7	2	.9	7	1.7
4. Burglary/Theft	3	1.6	1	.4	4	1.0
5. Bus Conduct	1	.5	3	1.3	4	1.0
6. Destruction of Property			4	1.7	4	1.0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	27	14.5	10	4.3	37	8.9
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	59	31.8	51	22.0	110	26.2
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	38	20.4	63	27.2	101	24.2
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	3	1.6	7	3.0	10	2.4
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	4	2.2	2	.9	6	1.4
14. Fighting	19	10.2	25	10.7	44	10.5
15. Gambling	4	2.2	1	.4	5	1.2
16. Indecent Exposure			1	.4	1	.2
17. Loitering/Trespassing	12	6.5	15	6.5	27	6.5
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	6	3.2	11	4.7	17	4.1
19. Possession or selling of drugs	1	.5	22	9.5	23	5.5
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			3	1.3	3	.7
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	2	1.1	3	1.3	5	1.2
23. Selling goods illegally			1	.4	1	.2
24. Smoking in unassigned area			5	2.2	5	1.2
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	186	100.0	232	100.0	418	100.0

Southern High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	81	85	104.9	463	243	52.5	544	328	60.3
10	70	45	64.3	370	73	19.7	440	118	26.8
11	66	47	71.2	352	79	22.4	418	126	30.1
12	37	33	89.2	247	108	42.0	294	141	47.9
Total	254	210	82.7	1,442	503	34.9	1,696	713	42.1

Suspensions by Offense

Offense	Black		White		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff			1	.2	1	.1
3. Assault on Student			2	.4	2	.3
4. Burglary/Theft						
5. Bus Conduct	1	.5	3	.6	4	.6
6. Destruction of Property						
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	28	13.3	44	8.7	72	10.1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	89	42.3	137	27.2	226	31.7
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	14	6.7	84	16.7	98	13.7
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	6	2.9	8	1.6	14	2.0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	47	22.4	157	31.2	204	28.7
14. Fighting	11	5.2	23	4.6	34	4.8
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	.5			1	.1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages			6	1.2	6	.8
19. Possession or selling of drugs	1	.5	21	4.2	22	3.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons			1	.2	1	.1
22. Profanity or vulgarity	6	2.9	5	1.0	11	1.5
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	1.4	9	1.8	12	1.7
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)			2	.4	2	.3
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code	3	1.4			3	.4
Totals	210	100.0	503	100.0	713	100.0

Stuart High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	146	124	84.9	323	154	47.7	469	278	59.3
10	88	66	75.0	264	81	30.7	352	147	41.8
11	54	39	72.2	234	54	23.1	288	93	32.3
12	61	24	39.3	234	43	18.4	295	67	22.7
Total	349	253	72.5	1,055	332	31.5	1,404	585	41.7

Suspensions by Offense

Offense	Black		White		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff						
3. Assault on Student	16	6.3	3	.9	19	3.2
4. Burglary/Theft	3	1.2	8	2.4	11	1.9
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property	1	.4	6	1.8	7	1.2
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	52	20.6	26	7.8	78	13.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	41	16.2	61	18.5	102	17.4
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	28	11.1	45	13.7	73	12.5
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	10	4.0	20	6.0	30	5.1
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.4	1	.3	2	.3
14. Fighting	63	24.8	41	12.3	104	17.8
15. Gambling			4	1.2	4	.7
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing			9	2.7	9	1.5
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	4	1.6	18	5.4	22	3.8
19. Possession or selling of drugs	1	.4	34	10.2	35	6.0
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			1	.3	1	.2
21. Possession of weapons	1	.4			1	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	11	4.3	6	1.8	17	2.9
23. Selling goods illegally	4	1.6	1	.3	5	.9
24. Smoking in unassigned area	17	6.7	37	11.1	54	9.2
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation			11	3.3	11	1.9
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	253	100.0	332	100.0	585	100.0

Valley High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	56	40	71.4	304	53	17.4	360	93	25.8
10	51	19	37.2	224	27	12.1	275	46	16.7
11	63	14	22.2	228	19	8.3	291	33	11.3
12	47	3	6.4	198	8	4.0	245	11	4.5
Total	217	76	35.1	954	107	11.2	1,171	183	15.6

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	2	1.3	1	.9	2	1.1
3. Assault on Student	1	1.3	1	.9	2	1.1
4. Burglary/Theft	3	3.9	2	1.9	5	2.7
5. Bus Conduct	1	1.3			1	.5
6. Destruction of Property			10	9.3	10	5.5
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	8	10.6	5	4.7	13	7.1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	8	10.6	9	8.4	17	9.3
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)						
10. Excessive cutting of class	21	27.7	34	31.8	55	30.1
11. Extortion	1	1.3			1	.5
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	3	3.9			3	1.6
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	3	3.9	3	2.8	6	3.3
14. Fighting	22	28.9	37	34.6	59	32.3
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing			2	1.9	2	1.1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages						
19. Possession or selling of drugs			1	.9	1	.5
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons						
22. Profanity or vulgarity	4	5.3			4	2.2
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area			2	1.9	2	1.1
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	76	100.0	107	100.0	183	100.0

Waggener High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	87	35	40.2	230	39	17.0	317	74	23.3
10	56	27	48.2	200	14	7.0	256	41	16.0
11	42	9	21.4	234	12	5.1	276	21	7.6
12	35	5	14.3	248	8	3.2	283	13	4.6
Total	220	76	34.5	912	73	8.0	1,132	149	13.2

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff						
3. Assault on Student						
4. Burglary/Theft	1	1.3			1	.7
5. Bus Conduct	1	1.3			1	.7
6. Destruction of Property	3	3.9			3	2.0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	11	14.6	8	11.0	19	12.8
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	21	27.7	14	19.3	35	23.4
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	1	1.3			1	.7
10. Excessive cutting of class	1	1.3	5	6.8	6	4.0
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	3	3.9	9	12.3	12	8.1
13. Excessive tardiness (school)			2	2.7	2	1.3
14. Fighting	24	31.7	13	17.8	37	24.8
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing						
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages						
19. Possession or selling of drugs	2	2.6	16	21.9	18	12.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks						
21. Possession of weapons	2	2.6			2	1.3
22. Profanity or vulgarity	3	3.9	2	2.7	5	3.4
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	3.9	4	5.5	7	4.7
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	76	100.0	73	100.0	149	100.0

Western High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	131	121	92.4	401	134	33.4	532	255	47.9
10	95	51	53.7	297	88	29.6	392	139	35.5
11	90	25	27.8	354	37	10.5	444	62	14.0
12	64	7	10.9	276	32	11.6	340	39	11.5
Total	380	204	53.7	1,328	291	21.9	1,708	495	28.9

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson			2	.7	2	.4
2. Assault on Staff	2	1.0			2	.4
3. Assault on Student	1	.5			1	.2
4. Burglary/Theft	6	2.9			6	1.2
5. Bus Conduct						
6. Destruction of Property			1	.3	1	.2
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	14	6.9	2	.7	16	3.2
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	9	4.4	2	.7	11	2.2
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)			1	.3	1	.2
10. Excessive cutting of class	76	37.2	76	26.2	152	30.7
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	33	16.2	55	18.9	88	17.9
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.5	4	1.4	5	1.0
14. Fighting	23	11.3	22	7.6	45	9.1
15. Gambling			1	.3	1	.2
16. Indecent Exposure						
17. Loitering/Trespassing			2	.7	2	.4
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	.5	7	2.4	8	1.6
19. Possession or selling of drugs	5	2.5	39	13.4	44	8.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	2	1.0	2	.7	4	.8
21. Possession of weapons	1	.5	1	.3	2	.4
22. Profanity or vulgarity	6	2.9	2	.7	8	1.6
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	24	11.7	72	24.7	96	19.4
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)						
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code						
Totals	204	100.0	291	100.0	495	100.0

Westport High School

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	97	119	122.7	242	78	32.2	339	197	58.1
10	71	81	114.1	200	49	24.5	271	130	48.0
11	58	57	98.3	238	48	20.2	296	105	35.5
12	35	10	28.6	190	19	10.0	225	29	12.9
Total	261	267	102.3	870	194	22.3	1,131	461	40.8

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson						
2. Assault on Staff	3	1.1			3	.7
3. Assault on Student	4	1.5			4	.9
4. Burglary/Theft	9	3.4	2	1.0	11	2.4
5. Bus Conduct	2	.7			2	.4
6. Destruction of Property	2	.7	1	.5	3	.7
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	46	17.3	6	3.1	52	11.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	34	12.7	12	6.2	46	10.0
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	1	.4			1	.2
10. Excessive cutting of class	60	22.6	70	36.2	130	28.1
11. Extortion						
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	45	16.9	33	17.0	78	16.9
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.4	1	.5	2	.4
14. Fighting	30	11.3	21	10.8	51	11.1
15. Gambling						
16. Indecent-Exposure	1	.4			1	.2
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	.4	1	.5	2	.4
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	3	1.1	9	4.6	12	2.6
19. Possession or selling of drugs	8	3.0	11	5.7	19	4.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks			3	1.5	3	.7
21. Possession of weapons	2	.7	2	1.0	4	.9
22. Profanity or vulgarity	4	1.5	2	1.0	6	1.3
23. Selling goods illegally						
24. Smoking in unassigned area	6	2.2	10	5.2	16	3.5
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)	4	1.5	10	5.2	14	3.0
26. Walkout participation						
27. Violation of dress code	1	.4			1	.2
Totals	267	100.0	194	100.0	461	100.0

System Wide

Suspensions by Grade Level

Grade	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,885	2,487	86.2	8,512	2,346	27.6	11,397	4,833	42.4
10	2,082	1,214	58.3	6,845	1,219	17.8	8,927	2,433	27.3
11	1,847	768	41.6	6,816	945	13.9	8,663	1,713	19.8
12	1,289	289	22.4	5,868	619	10.5	7,175	908	12.7
Total	8,103	4,758	58.8	28,041	5,129	18.3	36,144	9,887	27.4

Suspensions by Offense

	Black		White		Total	
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	16	.3	14	.3	30	.3
2. Assault on Staff	47	1.0	22	.4	69	.7
3. Assault on Student	99	2.1	37	.7	136	1.4
4. Burglary/Theft	107	2.2	31	.6	138	1.4
5. Bus Conduct	23	.5	18	.4	41	.4
6. Destruction of Property	30	.6	55	1.1	85	.9
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	809	17.0	381	7.4	1190	12.0
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	796	16.7	679	13.1	1475	14.9
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	23	.5	46	.9	69	.7
10. Excessive cutting of class	1025	21.6	1438	28.0	2463	24.9
11. Extortion	16	.3	1	0	17	.2
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	360	7.6	363	7.1	723	7.3
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	145	3.0	293	5.7	438	4.4
14. Fighting	632	13.3	468	9.1	1100	11.2
15. Gambling	24	.5	11	.2	35	.4
16. Indecent Exposure	3	.1	2	0	5	.1
17. Loitering/Trespassing	144	3.0	129	2.5	273	2.8
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	50	1.1	123	2.4	173	1.7
19. Possession or selling of drugs	104	2.2	443	8.5	547	5.5
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	6	.1	23	.4	29	.3
21. Possession of weapons	17	.4	7	.1	24	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	132	2.8	84	1.6	216	2.2
23. Selling goods illegally	6	.1	7	.1	13	.1
24. Smoking in unassigned area	118	2.5	324	6.3	442	4.5
25. Truancy (over 16 years of age)	15	.3	67	1.3	82	.8
26. Walkout participation			62	1.2	62	.6
27. Violation of dress code	11	.2	1	0	12	.1
Totals	4,758	100.0	5,129	100.0	9,887	100.0